

THE PRAYER BOOK CRISIS

ON February 7th of last year the Anglican Hierarchy presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York a draft of their proposals for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, the result of many years deliberation both in Convocation and in the Assembly. With some modifications that draft was accepted in March. If the Anglican Church was not essentially under State control, the matter would have ended there: the revised Prayer Book, containing the Old with permissive variations, would have taken its place in Anglican worship at the time appointed by the authorities. But, just as previous Prayer Books had been Acts of Parliament, deriving their authority from the Crown, so this new enterprise could have no effect till sanctioned in the same manner. Parliament in 1919 had delegated to a new body, the National Assembly of the Church of England, consisting of the two Convocations, together with a third House representing the laity, the task of "deliberating on all matters concerning the Church of England and making provision in respect thereof," and, if the questions were important enough to require Parliamentary sanction, of embodying their proposals in a Measure to be thereupon approved (or rejected) by the State. The revision of the Prayer Book was obviously such a question, for it was upon the basis of that Book, authorized by Parliament in 1662, that the Establishment was set up again after the Restoration. Accordingly the Revised Prayer Book was debated in the Church Assembly, and finally approved in July. Then, so carefully is the limited autonomy of that Assembly controlled, it became the business of a standing Parliamentary Ecclesiastical Committee of 30 members, nominated without respect to party or creed from both Houses, to scrutinize the Measure, taking whatever evidence regarding its meaning and scope that they desired, in order to ascertain whether or not it invaded any constitutional right, since, if it did, it could not be allowed to go forward. The Ecclesiastical Committee reported favourably of the Measure, and on December 12th—14th it was debated and passed by the House of Lords; only, on December 15th, to be discussed

and rejected by the House of Commons. This final result constitutes the Prayer Book crisis. Its gravity is beyond dispute. The Measure was the first legislative effort of any importance that the National Church had put forth since Parliament had relaxed its bonds and allowed it in some degree to govern itself. The Measure was framed at the instigation of Parliament itself, speaking through a Royal Commission appointed in 1904 to inquire into disorders in the Church and make recommendations. The Commission did make recommendations after two years' consideration of the matter,—very sensible recommendations on the whole, an extract from which it will be well to bear in mind for the better understanding of the late rebuff. This report said, *inter alia* (italics, here and in all subsequent quotations, ours):

The law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It needlessly condemns much which a great section of Church people, including many of its most devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterized by a care for ceremonial, a sense of dignity in worship and an *appreciation of the continuity of the Church*, which were not similarly felt when the law took its present shape. In an age which has witnessed an extraordinary revival of spiritual life and activity, the Church has had to work under regulations fitted for a different condition of things, without *that power of self-adjustment* which is inherent in the conception of a living Church. . . . It is important that the law should be reformed, that *it should admit of reasonable elasticity*, and that the means of enforcing it should be improved; but, above all, it is necessary that it should be obeyed. That a section of the clergy should, with however good intentions, conspicuously disobey the law, and *continue to do so with impunity*, is not only an offence against public order, but also a scandal to religion and a cause of weakness to the Church of England.

The first of the underlined phrases in the above passage shows that the Commissioners had themselves come to believe that the Elizabethan Settlement had not set up a new Church; the second, that they resented the rigid State control which had characterized that Church from the start; the

third, that they were dimly conscious of the impotence of that Church to teach dogmatically; the fourth, that the "Anglo-Catholics"—for in the Anglican system no other "law-breakers" are ever censured—had become too powerful to be easily put down. Indeed, the Report makes plain by copious evidence that, though the old Prayer Book was still supposed to be the norm of belief and practice, its violation had become increasingly prevalent.

Those familiar with the chequered and haphazard genesis of "our incomparable liturgy" can hardly wonder at the fact. The notion of compelling uniformity of belief by enforcing uniformity of external worship was worthy of the age of Tudor tyranny which begot it, although one would have thought that the laxer spirit of the Restoration would have discarded that notion. And the very form of the Prayer Book made it a very inadequate means of determining the belief and discipline of the new Church. Like the Bible itself, it is a library rather than a book. It is a combination of extracts from breviary, sacramentary, missal, and ritual, together with a catechism, the Psalter and a Litany, translated and adapted for the most part from the various Catholic service-books so as to exclude many specifically Catholic doctrines, especially those concerning the Holy Eucharist, and bound together in one volume so as the more effectively to prevent the use of any of the Catholic books which it supplanted. It retains, no doubt, mingled with its heresies, much of the traditional Christian belief and, making abundant use of Holy Scripture, it is full of edifying prayers in melodious language, but, like Holy Scripture, it is incapable of self-explanation and, even when supplemented by those "ambiguous formularies," the Thirty-Nine Articles, it forms a very imperfect rule of faith. And hence, no sure guide to practice either, for practice follows faith, and if the latter is vague and variable, so will the former be. This inadequacy is candidly owned by the compilers of the various revisions of the original Book. Each several revision has been the result of a certain compromise. During the Commonwealth the out and out Protestants actually abolished the Book altogether, although the 1662 revisors claimed that it had never been legally repealed. But that revision was felt to be definite enough to produce, as the first effect of the new Act of Uniformity which embodied it, a rejection of the Book by a multitude of clergy and the growth of Dissent. It

was, doubtless, for this reason that the recently-rejected Book, by allowing alternative "uses," made open and formal provision for the varying beliefs of those for whom it was intended.

This much past history must be borne in mind for the full understanding of the present situation. It is full of interest, as all religious upheavals must be, to members of the true Church. Anything that emphasizes what reason itself asserts, viz., that certainty regarding supra-rational truth can be attained only by special revelation from God to the individual or through some human yet infallible authority, must help men to realize that, assuming the fact of revelation, the Church's claim to teach with authority, as her Founder taught, is wholly natural and reasonable. And nothing more strongly emphasizes that reasonable presumption than the spectacle of the recurrent failure of Anglicanism to assert authority as teacher and guide whilst at the same time disclaiming infallibility. It cannot be done. The principle of private judgment, which everyone who does not defer to a living and ruling infallible authority *must* profess, is an irresistible solvent of revealed truth. "Churches," associations for religious purposes, may hang together for a time by reason of "confessions" or trust-deeds or State support, but their unity is merely external and artificial, for their members have no criterion of truth save the exercise of their reason, and reason alone cannot discover or comprehend supernatural revelation. Thus the literal acceptance of Prayer Book and Articles has never been a matter of conscience with Anglicans; they are told that the doctrines which these documents set forth or imply are conformable to the inspired Word of God, but they are left free to interpret that Word, and, therefore, those doctrines, as their reasons dictate. Consequently, the Prayer Book notwithstanding, each "school of thought" in the English Church has taught its own doctrine and modified its ritual accordingly, each claiming a right to do so, and denying, with more or less consistency, the claims of the rest. The Royal Commission called the resulting chaos "a scandal to religion," but an impartial outsider would not so qualify that great diversity of belief and practice. He would simply regard it as the natural outcome of principles inherent in Anglicanism from the first, a lawful assertion of the rights of conscience in the absence of any compelling au-

thority. Those who rejected Anglicanism rather than subscribe to the Book of 1662 gave a fine example of devotion to principle:—the modern Anglican clergyman, more logical if less heroic, is content to "interpret" the Prayer Book to suit his own views.

Things might have gone on as they were at the end of the last century but for that Protestant champion, Sir William Harcourt, part, at least, of whose mantle seems to envelop our present Home Secretary. He raised such an outcry about the "disorders in the Church" that the Bishops, in self-protection, were obliged to take action. Being, as the Royal Commission confessed, "without that power of self-adjustment which is inherent in the conception of a living Church," they had recourse to Parliament, which authorized them, through Convocation and the Church Assembly, to set their house in order. It is interesting to note that there was no popular demand for the revision of the Prayer Book. The House of Laity in the Assembly passed a resolution which opened thus—

That while this House believes that the great majority of the laity are satisfied with the present service of the Holy Communion . . .

Lord Parmoor said in the Lords that he was certain that was true of the vast majority of the laity who take interest in the matter. The Bishop of Gloucester in 1922 admitted that at least 90 per cent of the ordinary members of the Church of England would much prefer that there should be no alteration in the Prayer Book (*Times*, Nov. 15th). In 1923 the Bishop of Durham called attention to the fact that there was no public demand for any revision at all, and that such demand as there was seemed to him almost entirely clerical. Dean Inge, in a book of essays published last year, speaks of "those constitutional changes, for which there was no demand from the mass of the laity," being "pushed through by a group of busy-bodies," to wit, the Romanizers. Both Sir John Simon and Sir Douglas Hogg in the Commons voiced the grievances "of those thousands of law-abiding members of the Church of England who have never sought to depart from its doctrine and who resent a change being forced upon them."

The Catholic reader will note the implication underlying these complaints. Anglicanism, in accordance with the

principle of private judgment, has obliterated the distinction between the *Ecclesia docens* and the *Ecclesia discens*. Although in the Catholic Church the universal consensus of the faithful has its function in disclosing innovations in doctrine, still Christ's revelation is maintained in its purity and taught in its entirety by the divinely-commissioned Catholic hierarchy. There were no Houses of Laity in the pre-Reformation Church: there are none in the Catholic Church to-day. Pius X. carried through a radical reformation of the Canon Law, greatly affecting the discipline of the Church, though not of course its doctrine, yet none of the many millions of lay Catholics resented, or thought of resenting, his not being consulted. On the other hand, Anglicanism following a natural development has become more and more Congregationalist. To this we find abundant testimony in the Prayer Book debates, as may be seen from the following selection of authorities:

We literally could not have done more *to secure the opinion of the Church* on the subject. . . . It was especially *in deference to the wish of the laity* that we did not put out two Books. . . . Far more important than the actual vote is the significance of the united voice, not of the clergy only *but of the laity*. *These, after all, are the people with whom the responsibility rests*, the people on whom the trust is laid. (Archbishop of Canterbury).

With all respect to the Bishops, are they the only judges on this question? *Very few lay Englishmen will take their religion from their officers*. (Lord Hanworth).

I would do nothing which in my opinion would weaken the effect of the [Enabling] Act. I regard it as the *Magna Charta of the Church layman*. It has given him a *recognized position* for the first time. It has given him *authority* for the first time. (Lord Parmoor).

With regard to the Athanasian Creed, I am personally very glad that under this Measure it will not be said *so often* and will not be *obligatory*, because I believe that *the vast majority of the people of this country . . . really do not believe in the Athanasian Creed*, and, if they do not, I think it a very great mistake that it should be said in churches. (Lord Daryngton).

You [the Bishops] should remember that you are incurring a very great and grave responsibility if you pass

[the Measure] *without an appeal to the people*, or without letting the people know what is taking place. (Duke of Buccleuch).

Howbeit, when all which the wisdom of all sorts can do is done for devising of laws in the Church, it is *the general consent of all which giveth them the form and vigour of laws*. (Bishop of Durham, quoting Hooker).

The only way to deal with these [irregular] liturgical practices is to get behind you the *great body of moderate rational Anglo-Catholic opinion* in favour of law and order, assuring them that *their wishes will be respected*. (Lord Hugh Cecil).

When you are dealing with a change which vitally affects the Established Church of this country, you have to be satisfied, in my submission, *that the people of this country desire the change*. (Sir Douglas Hogg).

In face of this general consensus of Anglican opinion, clerical and lay, it is to little purpose that the Archbishop of York protests—"I have yet to learn that it belongs to the principles of the Established Church that its forms of worship should be settled by a plebiscite of the people." As one of the principles of Anglicanism is the final supremacy of the individual judgment, it follows that a large and consentaneous majority has a right to have its desires concerning public worship consulted. So much was admitted in 1925 by the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, who told his diocesan conference that "whatever form of service was adopted in any church must be in accord with the general mind of the congregation concerned,"—no doubt, within the limits of the projected Book.

Corresponding to this conception of the pastoral office, natural enough in a non-teaching Church, is the recognition by its prelates and many of its members of the right of the Crown in Parliament to control its internal affairs. That right is undoubted. Those clerics and politicians who worked with Elizabeth to institute a new non-Papal Church, only succeeded in changing masters. The English Catholic Church through its Hierarchy resisted the change to the last, and Elizabeth, unable to pervert the Bishops, drove them from their sees and filled their places with men who, as Bishops, were literally her own creatures. Whatever episcopal powers these men held and exercised came direct from the Crown. There was nowhere else for it to come from.

It was Elizabeth who, as she boasted, made Bishops and could unmake them. The Catholic Church survived in the imprisoned Catholic prelates and persecuted faithful: the witness of its martyrs and confessors cannot be gainsaid. The new body was essentially a lay organization without ecclesiastical jurisdiction, however its possession of the material fabric of the old Church disguised the fact. And a lay organization it remains. It is strictly true, if somewhat unkind, to say that the recent Commons vote was, for the Church of England, "Her Master's Voice." Listen to her chief, speaking in Parliament:

We hear words, which I think windy and even foolish, to the effect that this [Measure] *is not really a matter for Parliament*, that the Church has spoken its own voice decidedly, and that the duty of Parliament is to endorse what the Church has said. *I dissent altogether from that view. I dissociate myself from that statement.* We are acting under what is known as the Enabling Act. That Act, as a Bill, was introduced by me at this Table some eight years ago, and I took care in introducing it . . . to point out that though Parliament was, and I think most rightly, substituting a workable for an unworkable system of Church legislation, *Parliament was not depriving itself in the end of any fundamental right.* I adhere to that to-day. Every Member of this House has in my view *his absolute right to vote freely* upon a matter of this kind.

This position, so clearly and honestly set forth, was frequently re-asserted during the debates, and it is unnecessary to multiply endorsements. The English Church was made by the State: establishment is of its essence: disestablished, it would disintegrate into its various component sects, the survival of which would depend on the spontaneous religious sentiment of their members. The "Anglo-Catholics'" conception of their Church, which they are so vigorously asserting to-day, has, as Newman long ago foretold,¹ developed on wholly opposite lines. With their beliefs, they have no rightful place in the Establishment, and, illogical as are the Protestants who are trying to suppress them, the Protestant

¹ See the Fourth of his "Lectures on the Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching" where instance after instance is given of the essential Erastianism of the Establishment.

position is historically impregnable. A entity does not lose its essential character by mere lapse of time. If the Church of England was a creation of the State to begin with, it is so still. The change in the tenure of the Crown from Tudor absolutism to its modern Parliamentary form has only altered the manner, without mitigating the fact, of Anglican bondage. "As long as the Church is established," said Sir W. Joynson Hicks in the debate, "the final right lies with Parliament. To-day, the final right lies with the Commons of England." And in the presumably conscientious exercise of that right, the Commons of England, by a majority composed wholly of non-Anglicans, rejected the Assembly Measure because they suspected and feared that it aimed at subverting the basis of the Establishment. Be it noted that if Parliament had approved of the Measure, the subordinate position of the Church would have been just as real, though not so marked. It is only by grace of the Civil Power that Anglicanism can ever determine its belief and worship.¹ Its sole source of jurisdiction to rule and to teach is the Crown. The Prime Minister selects the Bishops, and each Prelate on his appointment professes his acceptance of the Royal Supremacy in these words:

I do hereby declare that your Majesty is the only supreme Governor of this our realm *in spiritual and ecclesiastical things as well as in temporal . . .* and I acknowledge that I hold [my] Bishopric *as well the spiritualities* as the temporalities thereof, *only* of your Majesty.

The outcry against the rejection of the Book in which several of the Bishops, less wise than the Primates, have joined betokens, as well as a proper sense of the spiritual freedom that belongs of right to a Church claiming to be God's institution, also a widespread misunderstanding of the real character of the Establishment. The Archbishops' interim declaration, issued on December 23rd, was dignified and sensible:

It was within the right of the House of Commons to reject the Measure. On the other hand, mere acquies-

¹ "Every change in ecclesiastical law or in conduct of the services which has hitherto taken place, has done so by Parliamentary consent and enactment, and I cannot see that the refusal to pass the Measure, however much we may regret it, differs in principle from the practice that has hitherto obtained" (Bishop of St. Edmundsbury in his *Diocesan Gazette*).

cence in its decision would be in our judgment inconsistent with the responsibilities of the Church as a spiritual society.

A hint at the possibility of independent action follows:

The Bishops fully recognize that there are circumstances in which it would be their duty to take action, in accordance with the Church's inherent spiritual authority. We realize this duty and are ready, if need be, to fulfil it.

But these circumstances have not, they hold, arisen. They think the Commons acted without full understanding, and accordingly intend to reintroduce a less ambiguous Measure as soon as the legal procedure permits—"to revise and revive," as a *Times* leader puts it. Meanwhile they appeal to the clergy not to use the rejected Book. Upon the treatment by Parliament of the Book so revised will obviously depend the larger question of Disestablishment.

Will the Protestants who procured the rejection of the Measure be content with a clearer explanation of its objects? As the main object is to provide a Prayer Book which men of different religion can interpret as they please, is not ambiguity of its essence? Lord Hugh Cecil, speaking of the new matter in the revised Book, admitted in the Commons that

the liturgical forms of the Church of England *ought to be* tolerant of the expression of more meanings than one. They ought to be such that worshippers who hold *rather different opinions* can always join in. . . . Those changes . . . have been carefully framed so that Evangelicals as well as Anglo-Catholics will listen to them and put upon them the particular meaning with which they approach the Holy Communion. The desire has been all through to keep unimpaired the "comprehension" of the Church.

And this "comprehensiveness" was insisted upon by speaker after speaker in the debates as the distinctive mark and the glory of Anglicanism. With this "note" in mind the Archbishop of Canterbury strenuously maintained against the Protestants that the new Book made no change in the doctrine of the Established Church. Yet his emphatic words, which were echoed by many Bishops and others, failed to convince the opponents of the Book, either because they

denied this characteristic of their Church or because they thought the book went beyond what was permissible in comprehensiveness. It puzzles the outsider that members of a body founded on the principle of private interpretation of the Scriptures should so resent the idea of doctrinal change, especially as the same people make "the unchangeableness of Rome" a reproach against the Church, until he reflects that the sticklers for the faith once delivered to Elizabeth are swayed by political rather than theological motives. Sir W. Joynson Hicks and his stalwarts showed not the slightest concern about the concessions to Modernism contained in the Revised Book: it was all one to them that the doctrines of original sin, the eternity of hell, the plenary inspiration of Scripture, even the Trinity itself, had been made, so to speak, optional. They were willing to allow complete liberty of prophesying in the direction of whittling down the creeds, but they were keen to detect and swift to denounce any attempt to regain what the Elizabethans had discarded. For that would be to return to Rome and all her terrors—her bondage of the intellect, her enslavement of the will, her political domination,—and the knees of these good Protestants fairly shook at the prospect. Hence, as all agree, it was the suspicion that the new Book was comprehensive enough to include the specifically Catholic doctrine of a Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Eucharist that caused it to be wrecked. In the Protestant Church, illogically intolerant as ever, you are free to read into the Scriptures whatever teaching you please, provided it is not the central doctrine of the Catholic Church or her God-given right to your allegiance. The Bishops, forsooth, asked their flocks to accept their word that the Eucharistic doctrine of Anglicanism was unchanged: that attempt to teach with authority was quite enough to arouse suspicion. Lord Cushendun, an Ulster Irishman, protested in *The Times* (Jan. 14th) against any attempt to decide the Prayer Book question by "experts." "The English people," he wrote, with a fine disregard for pre-Reformation History, "have never been content to take their religious beliefs from authority, and never will." Lord Parmoor, a writer of greater weight, also (*Times*, Jan. 6th) asserts that:

The Bishops . . . have no separate authority apart from the Church as a whole, which, under Article 19 of Religion, is said to be a congregation of faithful men,

without distinction between clergy and laity. This is one of the distinctive features of the English Reformation. . . . The authority of the English Church *is not subjected to the decision of Bishops in controversies of faith*, except so far as they have derived authority from the temporal power [1]. The final appeal is not given to them but to Scripture. . . . No doubt this principle throws a great responsibility on the Anglican laity, but this responsibility must be shouldered, *if the privilege of free thought and action in religious doubt*, a privilege of priceless value, is to be maintained.

But this privilege of priceless value must never, of course, be exercised in a Romeward direction. Sir John Simon, not, to be sure, an Anglican, was even more emphatic in repudiation of spiritual authority in his speech against the Measure.

I hold [he said] most deeply by the view that any attempt to interfere with free judgment in matters of religion is a denial of human rights and an attempt to enslave the spirit of man. To me, at least, the attempt to exercise authority, to dictate what people should believe, whether that authority be exercised by Parliament or by priest, is equally abhorrent.

This of course is pure rationalism, the rejection of all supernatural revelation and the whole idea of a teaching Church. And, as we have seen, it is prevalent amongst Anglicans; perhaps, it found its most characteristic expression in an effort made in the discussion by Sir Martin Conway, Member for the Combined Universities, who derided any attempt to formulate supernatural truth.

You can tell a man in words [says this self-confessed agnostic] what he should do, but there is no possibility of framing a succession of words which will accurately define what a man shall believe. All dogma, therefore, has always been the cause of fierce verbal disputes. In fact, *the only thing you can safely assert about any dogma is that in the nature of things it must be wrong.*

To this pitiable pass have come the members of a Church which does not claim divine authority to teach and interpret divine truth. It is to minds like these that the poor Bishops had to present their hardly-won compromise. Mr. Chesterton has written lately about the moderns who have exchanged

the worship of the sun for the worship of the fog. Sir Martin Conway should readily qualify as a chief priest in that cult, for, later in his speech, he cries out for

Someone who will *not overthrow the old revelation*, who will *not disestablish the old faith*, but one who will carry us into a wider field and give us a new vision of the world that is beyond, etc., etc.

for more dogmas, in fact, to be added to the old.

It is obvious that only those Christians who think that Christ established no means by which His revelation could be communicated with clearness and certainty to all generations of mankind, can acquiesce in a "comprehensive," possibly-mistaken, Church. It is not so obvious why various members of that Church should, while glorying in comprehensiveness, attempt to set up definite limits to it by appealing to an Act of Parliament (for such in essence is the Book of Common Prayer) which confessedly is capable of multi-form interpretation. They seem to want to eat their cake and still have it, to unite freedom for themselves with coercion for others, to teach God's revelation without being sure of its contents, to obey (within limits) an official Book but to disobey the official guardians and administrators of the Book. The fact is they have no definite notion of the nature of a Church, no appreciation of the meaning of faith: there is one historical fact that they can grasp, viz., that the Elizabethan State rejected what it had hitherto regarded as the Catholic Church and set up a different one in its place. It was repeatedly asserted in the debates that the English National Church is fundamentally Protestant in genesis and character, and that it shows its Protestantism in nothing more clearly than in its rejection of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. We should say that the difference was more radical still, viz., the rejection of the Catholic doctrine of Church authority in matters of religion. However, the Protestants are indubitably right in holding that the English Church as originally founded was only potentially comprehensive (in so far as it acknowledged the right of private judgment) and quite positively intolerant of those essential Catholic dogmas, the teaching and ruling authority of the Pope, and the objective Real Presence of the Incarnate God in the Holy Eucharist, Sacrifice and Sacrament.

The Prime Minister, as we pointed out last month, quite clearly appraised the fundamental difference between the Elizabethan Establishment and the old Catholic Church which it supplanted. His words are worth while repeating for the sake of those to whom that difference is not so clear. He said:

The Church of England could not exist in any other country but our own. It could not exist in a Latin country, because it is a Church *essentially of comprehension* and a *Church of compromise*, and in it *devotional instincts* and *rational instincts* may, by its peculiar quality, live and grow together side by side.

Why, in the Premier's opinion, there is anything strange in what he calls devotional instincts and rational instincts co-existing is not clear, unless he holds that devotion does not need the support of faith-illuminated reason, but he is, we venture to say, definitely incorrect in saying further "that there has always existed from the time of the Reformation until to-day a double stream of opinion on the nature of the Sacrament." We believe that Anglican theology recognizes *three* Eucharistic theories, all of which are heretical. In fact, so hazy is that Church on that most important point that the late Archbishop Temple said bluntly, "The Church of England has not answered that question" (Oct. 1898); whilst the present Bishop of Norwich is equally positive "that the Church of England does not give definitions on the Sacrament of Holy Communion nor urge special theories" (Feb. 13, 1927). So if Mr. Baldwin keeps his pleasant imagery of "streams of opinion" about the Eucharist flowing side by side in the Anglican Church he must add at least another rivulet to his two and, moreover, make accommodation for the phenomenon that they do not flow side by side but in opposite and transverse directions. To conclude our remarks on this singular quality of Anglicanism, we may say that it is comprehensive because it is founded on free thought, not on authority, and that its comprehension of certain Catholic doctrines is debarred because they are excluded by the terms of its Establishment. The State created it to supplant and keep out the old Church, and the State, as Sir John Simon said, is not only entitled but bound to hold it to the bond.

There is much else that calls for comment in the four Hansard pamphlets which record the Prayer Book debates

and which, as we have said, paint so faithful a picture of essential Anglicanism. But the Book is again in the melting-pot, and discussion of it continues unabated in the press, and there will be other opportunities of studying this singular religious phenomenon. We may end by stressing what Newman maintained in 1850, that "the Providential Course of the Movement of 1833 [of which the "Anglo-Catholics" are the descendants] was not in the Direction of the National Church."¹ The fact has become much more obvious in our days than it was in Tractarian times. The "Anglo-Catholics" are much more Roman than were the Tractarians, but their attempt to read Catholicity into the Prayer Book is just as feeble and futile. With their views they have no right to exist in a Protestant Establishment. It is not to the point, nor is it true, to say that they have as much right as Modernists. Modernism is the natural fruit of private judgment on which Protestantism is based. "Anglo-Catholics" appeal to authority—a vague, impersonal, self-selected authority, it is true, but the principle is there. The Bishops can do nothing for them; even the revised Prayer Book outraged in many points their cherished beliefs, and the next attempt must needs be worse. Common sense itself repudiates the notion, adopted in desperation by some of their number, that Anglicanism is a League of Religions, a union of opposites and contradictories under one external government. There remains, it would seem, only one Christian and self-respecting course—to reject the Protestantism that rejects them, and press for freedom. And, apropos, a petition is being set on foot, as we write, by the most consistent "Anglo-Catholics," calling for Disestablishment.

JOSEPH KEATING.

¹ "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties," IV.

BELLARMINE¹

IT may be inherent in human nature to ignore, and so gradually to forget, what it does not wish to remember; certainly one is often struck with examples of this in reading the history of religion in England. For instance, there was a time when the name of Bellarmine was feared, and therefore was abused and ridiculed, by English divines more than was the name of any other Catholic ecclesiastic or theologian; now we may read the story of the English Reformation with scarcely a mention of him at all. It is well, then, that now that the bearer of that name has been raised to the honours of the altar, we in England should be given some better and fuller knowledge of him; and we cannot but thank Father Brodrick for the generosity with which he has undertaken this task, the labour and thoroughness which he has put into it, and the clear portrait he has given us as a result.

Apart from history, it must strike even Catholic students of theology that for them the name of Bellarmine has become a name and little more. Others of his contemporaries are still living forces, and stand for something very definite; Canisius, Suarez, Lessius, to mention only three of his own religious brethren, still have their works on the shelves of our theological libraries, while those of Bellarmine are seldom found, never consulted except for their historical interest and significance. The answer is clear. More than these others Bellarmine was a man of his own time; he was essentially the fruit of his own peculiar generation. Thus as some surmise that Newman, the needs of his own age having been outlived, will survive rather as an English classic than as an English theologian, so it may be said that Bellarmine, the spokesman of the Church in his time, survives rather as a landmark in history than as one among the Church's doctors. In a quite comparable sense, and over a far wider area, Bellarmine was the Newman of his day.

¹ "The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J. (1542—1621)." By James Brodrick, S.J. With an Introduction by His Eminence Cardinal Ehrle, S.J. In two volumes. Illustrated. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. 1,100. Price, 30s. n.

On this very account, the character and personality of the man are of interest; for to influence the minds of other men, more especially to influence an age, personality and character are no less essential than learning. The mere scholar can come and go, and the world need not be the wiser or the better; to produce an effect the scholar must have in himself something more than scholarship, must even be ready, if need be, to subordinate his learning to this other and nobler cause. This, we believe, is the secret of the real greatness of Bellarmine. Though at the time of his election to the Cardinalate, the then Holy Father said of him: "We elect this man because he has not his equal for learning in the Church of God," nevertheless we would venture to say that he was what he was, and his memory is to-day held in benediction, more because of the singular personality which was his, and because of the simple, selfless, generous way he gave himself to whatever task was put into his hands. Learning was to Bellarmine anything but an object in itself, and we have an abundance of evidence to show it.

In this place we cannot do more than enumerate some of the services rendered to the Church by Bellarmine's alert and courageous genius. In Louvain, at the age of twenty-six, he crosses swords with Baius, and thus provides the counter-stroke to the Jansenism of the future. In Rome, as Professor of Controversy, he keeps before himself the vision of all Europe, and on that vantage ground writes his "Controversies," the first effective blow to the Reformation, struck with its own weapons. In France he is led into the then burning discussion concerning the rights of governments and kings, and is the first to define in detail the position of the Church on this subject. In Rome again, he produces the Clementine Vulgate, replacing and correcting the less satisfactory work of Sixtus V. His name is accepted as the leader of one side in the great controversy on Grace. In Italy he acted as peacemaker between the Pope and other Italian states; at the same time he was at issue with the English king, James I. Later, as Cardinal, we find him deep in the study of the Eastern churches, hoping against hope for reunion. Then, too, he is compelled to take a leading part in the dispute concerning Galileo. He ends his days with his pen still in his hand, writing spiritual treatises for the benefit of young priests and ecclesiastics. A life, indeed, of tremendous labour

¹ See Brodrick, i. 400: other quotations from the Life, *passim*.

and of most varied interests, which Father Brodrick has described; here we are content to discover, if we can, some features of him who lived it.

It is striking to notice how consistently every understanding critic of Bellarmine has dwelt upon the simplicity and candour of the man as qualities always prominent. In his introduction to the present volumes Cardinal Ehrle emphasizes these above all else; and we may be sure that His Eminence speaks from wider knowledge than that gained from the reading of Father Brodrick's work. When Bellarmine was still a boy in his village of Montepulciano, and was offering himself as a candidate for the Society of Jesus, the Rector to whom he addressed himself wrote of him: "He has the intellect of an angel, and his actions, his conscience, his life, are all angelic."

When as a young man he is winning his spurs in the University of Louvain, this is what he says in one of his sermons: "We are all only children, and our one hope of salvation for each of us is to keep the heart and manner of a child."

After he has become Cardinal and Archbishop, and another bishop, anxious to resign his see that he may the more give himself to prayer, writes to him, this is the answer he receives:—

As long as our consciences assure us that we have not sought, nor desired, nor chosen a higher place, that at the present we have no liking for the world's honours and would willingly lay them aside if we could, as long as conscience tells us this, I do not see why we ought not to acquiesce in God's will, which has been made known to us clearly by the command of His Vicar.

Later again, when the Pope is dead, and the Spanish Ambassador is summing up for his sovereign the qualities of the possible candidates for the papacy, this is how he speaks of Bellarmine: "His great goodness (*Su gran bondad*), his learning, and his virtue render him worthy of the tiara, but his rectitude and candour are such that he would not hesitate to oppose any Prince whatever, if he considered that the good of the Church required him to do so."

Lastly, after he is dead, in the first account of him that is extant, written by an English Jesuit who had been present with him to the end, we find him thus described: "A man

of such lenity and meekness as he would offend none; of such candour and sincerity as he could not dissemble with any; of such kindness and courtesy as he was benevolous unto all."

We dwell upon these estimates of his character, first of all because we believe them to be the secret of Bellarmine's whole life. His childlike, spontaneous simplicity was at once his strength and his weakness. It made him see in his rivals, not only their errors, but also whatever could be said in their favour; he insisted on giving them fair play. Thus, in dealing with Baius, during his first early days at Louvain, never once does he mention the gloomy doctor by name; scarcely ever does he mention his doctrine. Instead, with cloudless urbanity, he lets the fresh air of his Italian hills blow through his sermons and addresses, humorous, sincere, hopeful, earnest; seeing in God a Father who wishes His children only well, seeing in His gifts only benefits; in this way he undermines the teacher's evil influence, and all Louvain loves him for it. When he has done with Baius, in an official report he thus describes him: "The aforesaid Michael is a man of great ability, and most learned in the study of St. Augustine. Furthermore, he seems to be a prudent, pious and singularly humble scholar."

In the same way, when later he deals with Calvin, he is careful to point out where that heresiarch is free from error; when he takes up arms against the English king, James, he writes as to a friend, who has only forgotten the traditions of his race and family, and who has made mistakes which need but to be corrected, not deliberate steps in heresy, which put him outside the Church. Though the famous controversy on Grace stirred up unwonted rancour among theologians, and though his name was taken by all as representative of one party, yet would he always be a friend to the other side, and, since there seemed in his time no likelihood of agreement, he advised the Pope to order that for the present all public controversy on the point should cease. Lastly, when Galileo began to stir the world, more by his ill-temper than by his novel discoveries, we find Bellarmine declining to condemn, seeking the opinion of scientists before he makes up his mind; in the end, when he is dead, referred to by Galileo himself as by far the most understanding of his judges.

Corresponding to this simplicity and candour is a peculiar sensitiveness of soul; it would seem that the suffering which

this entailed throughout his life was the special form of the cross which he was called upon to carry. The ease with which he gave his rivals their due, and allowed them full liberty to state their case, naturally roused opposition among those of lesser sympathy who, nevertheless, were on his side; in this we see his likeness to St. Thomas before him, and to Newman in our own day. Among these assailants were not a few Jesuit fathers; a fact which leads him to say, in a letter to the Father General, Aquaviva: "Instead of all pulling together as we ought, we bite one another; and in very truth, the enemies of a man are those of his own household."

To which Aquaviva characteristically replies: "Padre mio, you must not let this idle gossip make you down-hearted, nor must you surrender on account of it one little bit of the joy which you take in your work. That is exactly what the devil would like to happen. He does not approve of your labours."

This same sensitiveness is manifest in other ways. For instance in the Roman College, where he had been Professor and Spiritual Father, and now was Rector, the Father General Aquaviva had occasion to assure him of his trust in him. The assurance drew from Bellarmine a confession, which throws a revealing light on the undercurrents of his life: "I will tell you honestly that before I became Rector of the Roman College, I did have doubts about your trust in me, because of some complaints made to you by one who did not wish me well. All the same, I did not believe that you considered me too far gone in villainy, for you never showed me anything but kindness."

Hence we may read between the lines of a letter written in his declining years, to his favourite and brilliant pupil, Lessius in Louvain. The latter was at the time the master mind of that University; he had taught with strength, and had met with opposition; he had written to Bellarmine in complaint, and perhaps not a little despondency. The aged Cardinal had not agreed with everything Lessius had taught; nevertheless it was not this alone, nor was it only old age, which prompted the following reply: "Well done, Your Reverence! I approve and am glad that you have given up writing, and turned your mind to reading and contemplation, for it is almost impossible to write anything at present without laying oneself open to the cavils of either enemies or friends."

We have said that Bellarmine's simplicity and candour were at once his strength and his weakness. We see the first

exhibited in the almost unconscious spontaneity with which he faced every situation set before him. He is a school-master, and his readiness for sacrifice wins the affection of his pupils; he is a preacher at Louvain and the University knows it can trust him; he is a professor of controversy, and he stirs all Europe; all the time he seems utterly unaware that he is doing more than anyone else might do. He goes forward unafraid of enemies; what is more, he is equally unafraid of his friends. He is a Jesuit, but when he does not agree with the teaching of a brother Jesuit he speaks out; though a conclusion he has reached will rouse a whole religious order to oppose him, he does not hesitate to declare it. As the Pope's theologian he must undertake the censorship of a brother Jesuit's, or of a Dominican father's work; step by step he goes through it, approving or condemning, with an utter disregard of party or of consequences; when he has finished, and has passed sentence, then he will throw oil on troubled waters, by appealing for patience as the solvent of controversy, insisting on charity always, allowing neither side to abuse the other, and yet, in his simple, broad manner, begging that the door should be left open for discussion to continue. Whatever his own views, and as a theologian of his calibre they could not but be very decided, he has a word for every party; he has a word and a warning for the Pope himself; when conflict is over it is invariably seen that his simple, loving heart has not been dimmed a whit, but is ever more eager to heal by kindness the wounds which his decisions may have caused.

For the weakness, we have evidence all through his later life that this simplicity of the dove interfered not a little with the prudence of the serpent. Bellarmine was simple and took it for granted that others were the same; candidly sincere, and had to learn by bitter experience that not every soul, not even every holy soul, was like his own; trustful as a child, only to discover that not all men were to be trusted. He is made Rector of the Roman College; more than once the General Aquaviva has to reprove him for what seems too great yielding to his pupils; when another succeeds him the same Father General warns the new Rector not to imitate the over-trustfulness of his predecessor. He becomes Archbishop of Capua, and, says the author of the *Life*: "So meek and mild was the heart of Bellarmine that some took scandal at his mildness, and complained that he did not punish offences."

As Cardinal it was still more manifest. In the management of his household he was a sore trial to his *major-domo*, without whose correcting hand he must have got himself into much trouble. Onlookers could see in him little to esteem; thus we find the Spanish ambassador writing of him: "Bellarmine, who was taken by His Holiness from the Society of Jesus, is a good man and learned in theology, but not of much practical ability (*de poca sustancia in agibilibus*). He is known to be the mere creature of the pope and would scruple to accept a bribe."

Among the Cardinals themselves he gave some anxiety.

One of his friends, Cardinal del Bufalo, even lost patience with what he considered his excessive forbearance, and complained to Father Mutius Vitelleschi [the General of the Society of Jesus] about it. A certain member of the Congregation of the Holy Office was given to contradicting and insulting him on every possible occasion, yet all that he did was to shrug his shoulders and talk to his neighbour about the weather.

Father Vitelleschi ventured to remonstrate: "His answer to me, given with a laugh," Vitelleschi testified, "was: 'Ah, Father Mutius, an ounce of charity is worth more than all the reputation in the world.'"

For a right understanding of Bellarmine the man, apart from Bellarmine the theologian, it seems to us essential to emphasize this side of his character. He is ranked to-day among the saints; therefore we may be sure beforehand that he was like his Master in this one aspect among others,—that he had to endure the misinterpretation and abuse of those who should have supported him. "*Imitari te, in ferendis omnibus injuriis, et omni vituperio*," says his leader, Ignatius Loyola, and Bellarmine had abundant opportunity for putting that teaching into practice. We have already seen how much he felt it, in the early and active portion of his life; ten years after he had been made Cardinal, when he was now sixty-seven years of age, and the chief part of his work was done, we may ask ourselves what he thought of the following opinion of his labours. The letter is written by a theologian of the Vatican to the Holy Father, and from its tone it would seem to voice the mind of not one man alone:

Most Holy Father, in the interests of truth we must needs speak our mind plainly to the Lord and His Vicar on earth. If this little Christian (*questo cristianello*, i.e.

Bellarmino) was possessed of solid and true Christian zeal, instead of itching to write a new book every week in his own defence, he would restrain himself and set about correcting those erroneous opinions which the public authority of the Church will eventually have to correct.¹

And that this subtle kind of persecution continued to the end we have proof in the significant outburst of Father Coffin, written in the year after the Cardinal's death. In the opening of his "True Relation of the last Sickness and Death of Cardinal Bellarmine," he writes:—

Now is the candle no more layed under a bushell, but set on a candlesticke for all to behold. Now is the mouth of detractors stopped that would with their lyes have blemished his life, and disgraced his death, many yeares ere it happened. Now (will they, nill they), truth shall trample falsehood underfoot; and the cleare beames of Bellarmine's vertue overbeare all slaunderous reports of malignant Sacramentaries. Let them forge infamous fictions, let them print as they have done most exorbitant lyes, let malice matcht with learning arme their pens to write reproach, yet shall all their force and fury fall to the ground and his name be renowned for ever.

It would be ungracious to conclude this estimate of Robert Bellarmine without some notice of his relations with this country. Bellarmine had an interest which reached out to every nation; not only did he follow the vicissitudes of the Church in every European state, but in the evening of his life we find him looking beyond to the Eastern churches, and even to India and China. Nevertheless it may be said with certainty that he had a special love for England. In his Autobiography he is careful to tell us that when as a very young man he travelled on foot to Louvain, he had as his companions, "Doctor William Allen"—a name of which Catholic England must be ever proud—"and three others, two English and one Irish." What those men talked of on that journey we may well imagine. In Louvain and Douay he had ample opportunity to learn the troubles of our forefathers; it was in the early years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. When he left Louvain for Rome he went in the com-

¹ Pegna to Paul V., 1609. Brodrick, ii. 274.

pany of five Englishmen; more than ever may we be sure what those six men discussed on their way. Arrived in Rome, and appointed Professor of Controversy, we are expressly told that he lectured to the English students. The English College was founded, and from the first he took a special interest in its growth. When the first students took the oath of service to their country, which in their case meant readiness for martyrdom, Bellarmine was one of the witnesses; so full of admiration was he of their sacrifice that he offered to share it, and to go to England that he might put himself at the service of the stricken English Catholics.

After those days the name of Bellarmine soon became well known in England. Nowhere did the "Controversies" rouse more opposition; means of many kinds were taken to hold him up to ridicule; when the Clementine Vulgate appeared, with his introduction, it was found to be a good opportunity to round upon him and tear his reputation to pieces. Later he was driven to cross swords with a royal protagonist, no less than the English king, James I., himself; and it is an irony of fate that posterity to-day, English posterity in particular, finds itself ranged on the side of Bellarmine in the controversy, thanking him for the true definition of the rights of kings in contrast with those claimed by the Scottish-English monarch. James, maintaining the divine right of kings, as such would be absolute; Bellarmine showed him on what that divine right rested, coming back to his former teaching of constitutional monarchy. James, despising his ancestry, and even his mother, in spite of his Scottish accent would be more English than the English; Bellarmine, too simple-minded to believe that any man could be so disloyal to his own, was at pains in his argument to remind him of his Catholic forefathers, and in particular of his mother who, for conscience' sake, had been deprived of her all. As for the king's affectation of Englishry, Bellarmine has much to say which even to this day historians do not care to mention.

In the whole of this controversy it is evident that Bellarmine knew well the intellectual calibre of the man with whom he was dealing. Perhaps he failed to understand his soul, for the reason that, in his simplicity, he could not believe that such a man existed, much less that he could be the son of Mary Stuart. In any case, one suspects it was not altogether for the monarch's sake that he suffered himself to be drawn into the fray; it was rather for the sake of his Catholic subjects,

whom Bellarmine loved and admired, many of whom he had counted among his friends, whose loyalty to the truth he would not allow to be tarnished in any way. Thus we find him soon leaving James to the froth of his own ill-temper; he turns instead to encouraging Catholics in their resistance to the Oath of Supremacy, which implied the loss of that faith for which their fathers had died and their brethren were dying. What he said might stir up anger in other countries as well as in England; but English Catholics to-day must revere the name of Bellarmine for the way he has stood by them, and Englishmen who are not Catholics have reason to respect him for defining, more clearly than did any man before him, the true relation of the people to the crown.¹

Bellarmino was small of stature. From his childhood his health was not good, and he seems to have prematurely aged; before he was fifty we find him writing of himself as growing old. His sight was bad; he was deaf, in his later life quite deaf in the left ear, with the right, as he says, "he can hear well enough if people will speak up." For all that he had an attractive bearing; the natural simplicity of his character was ever apparent in his face, while the ease and affability of his manner was a wonder to his enemies. Only at times, when he was absorbed with some preoccupation, he would become silent and abstracted; when he was Rector of the Roman College he was admonished by the Father General to make himself more easily accessible to his subjects. But in his old age this was gone; then, when the summer came round, and the young Jesuit scholastics went to their villa in the hills, the aged Cardinal delighted to go with them, and they were no less delighted to have him. We have somewhere read that it was chiefly for these young men, and for these occasions, that he wrote the little spiritual treatises which appeared during his last years.

This is an aspect of the man whose "Life and Labours" Father Brodrick has described in the two large volumes he has set before us. We seem to recognize in him a singular resemblance to St. Paul; singleness of purpose which would not be thwarted, simple-mindedness which would always be true, unconsciousness of self which looked for no reward,

¹ The controversy with James I. would seem to complete the teaching of Bellarmine elsewhere concerning the rights and limitations of national authority. Father Brodrick (i. 241) gives interesting evidence to show how the Church's spokesman may have influenced the framing of America's Declaration of Independence.

sensitiveness which induced to depression but never quite surrendered, labour incessant, thorough, disinterested, and behind all a sense of the supernatural so familiar that to him it was a second nature. He was learned, but utilitarian rather than scholarly; a theologian, but practical rather than speculative; a master of the spiritual life, but with little of the mystic. Throughout his seventy-nine years he remained a child; as we have already hinted, we believe this to have been the one great secret of his influence. When we say that such is the portrait which seems to us to stand out from Father Brodrick's study, we trust we have said enough. His volumes teem with erudition; the author has left no stone unturned in his search for authentic material; his work will be welcomed in every student's library, whether of theology or history.

✠ ALBAN GOODIER.

CATHOLIC SPIRITUALITY

APROPOS OF "THE MIND OF THE SAINTS" ¹

"**T**HE Lives of the Saints," wrote Newman² eighty years ago, "are one of the main and special instruments to which under God we may look for the conversion of our countrymen at this time." As is well known, the series of biographies then started by Faber and Newman was a failure. In these lives the treatment was of course intolerably dry and unreal, in accordance with the traditions of a school of hagiography which was just beginning to wane. Miracles were accepted with an avidity akin to Ward's appetite for Papal Bulls; and, with the healthy-mindedness of a bygone age of faith, scandals in the Church were portrayed in a way which recalled the frankness of St. Catherine of Siena. But, above all, devotional practices and methods of piety were described which shocked the hard-headed common-sense spirituality of Victorian Catholic England. "It appears," wrote Newman to Faber, suspending the series of Lives, "that there is a strong feeling against it on the part of a portion of the Catholic community in England, on the ground, as we are given to understand, that the lives of foreign saints, however edifying in their respective countries, are unsuited to England and unacceptable to Protestants." With this feeling Newman declared that he had "no sympathy at all." But seventeen years later (in 1865) he wrote as if he had since acquired some sympathy; "I prefer English habits of belief and devotion to foreign, from the same causes and by the same right which justifies foreigners in preferring their own."³

It is to be noted that even then Newman did not set up the English, or rather the Victorian, standard as applicable with chronological and geographical universality. He held that practices prevalent, say, in Naples, or modes of expression used, say, in the "Glories of Mary" of St. Alphonsus de' Liguori, would appear exaggerated or in bad taste to his

¹ By C. V. Trent. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1926.

² Ward, "Life," i. 207. As I am meaning here to refer to "the Life of Father Doyle," I will quote a sentence from "a philosophical review" by Rev. Dr. John Murphy (*Catholic Gazette*, March, 1926, p. 66): "Is it not possible that this work might convert a sincere non-Catholic whom our Apologetics never will convert?"

³ Ward, i. 214.

fellow-countrymen. But he never suggested that they were wrong in Naples. There is a vast difference between availing oneself of one's liberty to choose means racially and individually congenial, and erecting one's own tastes and preferences into a norm of universal validity. It is the difference between an educated gentlemanly traveller in foreign parts and one of those loud-voiced tourists to whom their own country and language are obviously "God's own."

England, both Catholic and Protestant, has, I fancy, travelled a long way from the, to us, rather prim and dreary Victorian outlook on life and religion. Anglicanism has increased at the expense of Evangelicalism; insularity has decreased with modern facilities for travel and communication; finality in philosophy and history is not so calmly assumed now as in the days of Mill and Spencer, Hallam and Macaulay. But even yet one can easily discern among certain English Catholics traces of that, within its limitations, admirable outlook which is the relic of penal times and is the religious counterpart of Newtonian physics, Lockian philosophy, and Paley-Benthamite ethics. If it is question of a saint that lived in Lima or Ars, well, let it pass; there is no accounting for the ways of foreigners; what they do or did, is at any rate not "the thing" in England. But the life of a saint (in the popular sense) who lived in Dublin comes rather nearer home. Such a life, if written in English, is assumed by some to be necessarily amenable to a standard fixed by the prejudices of Protestants. As a matter of fact, I, though a "foreigner," believe that this dread of frightening off would-be converts by a frank exposition of the Catholic *ethos* is utterly unsupported by present-day facts; it is an anachronism derived from pre-Tractarian times. In any case, it is surely unreasonable to complain that a book, written primarily for Irish or Irish-American readers, should not take account of English modes of thought, whether Catholic or Protestant. Such a book—I am, of course, thinking of the Life of Father William Doyle—has a right to exist quite independently of its reaction on English readers. Should it be criticized from the standpoint of an out-of-date belated insularity, far from being representative of modern English Catholicism, it is quite open to the author to ignore the criticism as irrelevant.

There is presented, however, in the book which is mentioned in the title of this article, a totally different view of

spiritual perfection from that given by me in "Father William Doyle, S.J." It purports to defend the "English" ascetical point of view as an absolute standard and attempts a re-interpretation of Father Doyle. The matter seems to me worth a somewhat detailed examination, for more is involved than the reputation of my friend. The whole nature of traditional Christian asceticism seems called into question by Mr. C. V. Trent.

Reverting to my previous argument, I might content myself by showing that, even in his "holy follies" (as I have termed them), Father Doyle is singularly true to the traditions of the Irish Saints. Take for instance his extraordinary concentration on the presence of God. In Ultan's Hymn¹ St. Brendan is made to say: "From the day that I took orders I have never gone over seven ridges without my mind on God." And St. Brigid: "From the time that I set my mind on Him, I have never taken it from Him." Or consider his immersions in a pond. "Mortification by immersions in cold water," says Dom Gougaud,² "was notably in favour among ascetics in the Celtic countries, in Ireland, Wales, and elsewhere." In Fiacc's Hymn³ we are told of St. Patrick: "The cold of the weather used not to keep him from spending the night in pools. . . . He sang a hundred psalms every night. . . . He slept on a bare flagstone, with a wet quilt about him, his bolster was a pillar-stone." As far as Father Doyle is concerned, such episodes must not be exaggerated; they were merely isolated incidents in a life whose texture was quite normal; and I have shown good reason for holding that they were not "ascetic" at all. But in these and in several other matters there is a similarity between Father Doyle and his Celtic predecessors which seems to point to temperamental affinity. Hence if an English critic does not appreciate this Irish Jesuit, it may be merely because he has nothing in common with these impetuous and vigorous Celtic saints; let him, accordingly, abound in his own sense.

But when it comes to practically repudiating voluntary mortification or self-inflicted pain in general, it is time to inquire a little closely into this alleged English mentality:

¹ Stokes and Strahan, "Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus" (1903), ii. 324.

² "Devotional and Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages" (1927), p. 159. Such immersions are recorded of SS. Patrick, Ciaran, Columba, Comgall, Kevin, Fechin, Fursa and others.

³ Stokes and Strahan, ii. 315.

As to Father Doyle and his seeking after rather extravagant forms of pain, I think such phenomena must be explained as a form of artistic self-expression, which has probably been denied other outlets . . . Self-expression, in short, even (if you like to be severe) a sort of self-gratification. . . . So I think Doyle's romantic quest of suffering (*i.e.*, in *civil* life) was just as, and no more, pleasing to God than writing mystical poetry or composing a Mass.¹

On this view quite a number of people, from St. Patrick to Father Doyle, are bundled off to the neurologist or the psycho-analyst. For if their penances were a form of self-gratification or pain-lust, if their self-inflicted sufferings were merely the diversion of talents which might have been employed in art or literature, then undoubtedly all these men were pathological. And they were deluded too; for they were certainly under the impression that they were accomplishing something very different from "artistic self-expression"; had *that* been their object, they would and should have chosen a less painful and more obvious way in which to "express" themselves. Unless, of course, we adopt the very convenient and consoling belief that, unlike us, they did not feel suffering, that they were just "made that way"; which belief, however, is utterly inapplicable to Father Doyle who was extraordinarily sensitive to pain. But why limit this comforting aesthetic theory to the "quest of suffering" when it is "romantic," whatever that means? The mere amount of pain, supposed extravagant in Father Doyle, should not alter the quality of the "phenomena." The fasts or disciplines of your even-Christian should also be regarded as spoiled hymns or lost chords, artistic diversions or perversions.

However, the writer of the book containing the passage just cited admits that a certain amount of penance may be "self-discipline" or "keeping fit." As to the thirst for suffering exhibited by St. Teresa or St. John of the Cross, "one is tempted to look for its dim beginnings . . . in the pre-Christian contemplatives to which Carmel traces back its

¹ "The Mind of the Saints," p. 97. Mr. Trent gives no indication whatever that he rejects this view; he cites it as from some anonymous "letters of direction" (p. 48). The amazing restriction to "*civil* life" (italics not mine) seems to indicate that, to this theoriser, another standard of asceticism is permissible on the battle-field!

family tree";¹ to Israelitish excesses which, presumably, Christianity came to curb! But St. Edmund of Canterbury, St. Thomas Becket, Bl. Thomas More, Bl. Edmund Campion, and other Englishmen used the scourge and the hair-shirt; so these practices are "just the current notion of self-discipline," "the asceticism of keeping fit." I feel quite sure that this purely naturalistic Stoic notion is a complete perversion of the real theory. Nor do I see the slightest ground for asserting that "St. Francis's mystical idea of literally sharing our Lord's sufferings, or the other idea of expiating the sins of others by self-inflicted punishment, were not conscious ideas in the very medieval and very English mind of Edmund of Abingdon."² Was it, then, just "to keep fit" that the Saint's mother also wore a hair-shirt and an iron corselet? Was not St. Francis his contemporary? And was the mind of St. Edmund, educated in Paris, so "very English" after all? As to the ideas of imitating Christ and of making reparation for sins, surely they are coeval with Christianity itself. One has but to read St. Paul, St. Ignatius of Antioch or the Acts of the Martyrs, beginning with the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp.

This attempted explanation, then, of the function of pain in the life of a Christian seems to me to be entirely out of harmony with the facts of Christian experience, in England as elsewhere. It misses completely the many elements in Christian asceticism which are not susceptible of a naturalistic explanation. It utterly ignores language specifically Christian, such as: "With Christ I am nailed to the Cross," "I chastise my body that I may bring it into subjection," "I fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for His Body which is the Church." It conveys an echo of Charles Kingsley's "muscular Christianity." It seems to recommend the "mystery of the Cross" to the world by making it possible to water down "the current notion of self-discipline," so that football and cricket may take the place of fasting and hair-shirt. But it leaves an aching void, and it is a sorry apology for English Christianity—one which would be rejected with scorn by an Anglican, for instance, of the type of Scott Holland.

¹ "Mind of the Saints," p. 91. Yet "probably the attitude of mind and the feelings of such saints are altogether beyond our powers of imagination. . . . This asking for pain—and really and truly wanting it—we can't grasp" (pp 92 f.). But if you can't grasp a thing, if it is beyond your powers of imagination, why write a book about it or against it?

² *Ibid.* p. 31.

Moreover—to “raise the previous question”—are we quite so sure about this alleged English spiritual isolation? Was Catholic England ever isolated at all? Before the Reformation England shared the common life of Christendom. Afterwards, her pastors were trained in Rome, Salamanca, Paris, Douai and Rheims. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries certain ascetical views affected English Catholicism; but they are equally discernible in Ireland and France; Gallicanism and Jansenism are not the least of their ingredients. The attempt now to hark back to an imaginary post-Reformation golden age seems to an outsider simply a reversion to a spiritual life less full and less complex, to a state characterized by outer hindrance and inner dry-rot. Hence the following picture strikes me as quite unhistorical:

England, through being cut off from the rest of Christendom for a time, escaped many of these incidental reactions of the post-Reformation period on the Continent. What there is of such things amongst Catholics in this country, has been imported comparatively recently; it does not come from English writers; it doesn't fit the English mind. . . . The best way for us, perhaps, is to short-circuit the later mystics and pick up the threads of English Catholic piety where they were broken.¹

The writer probably does not realize that in this passage he is inviting the Catholic inhabitants of a country which as a whole lapsed from the Church at the Reformation, to discard summarily the spiritual ideals and methods of those who maintained the Catholic tradition unbroken and who in our day helped to restore England to the fullness of the faith. It is largely through the ministrations of the foreign-trained secular clergy and of post-Reformation Orders, such as the Society of Jesus, and through the exertions of those who never lost the faith, such as Irish Catholics, that Catholicism is in the position in which it is to-day in England. If this development “doesn't fit the English mind” (which I do not grant), it may be that it is the latter that is at fault. And is not all this talk about “short-circuiting” due rather to unconscious nationalism, mixed with a misinterpretation of the principles of medieval piety which, rooted out for a time in England, naturally developed elsewhere?

¹ “Mind of the Saints,” pp. 66 f.

In saying this, I am not forgetting the principle I enunciated at the beginning of this article, that methods and means which might suit an Italian might not be the best for an Englishman. But let us not exaggerate. No one proposes that English Catholics should start kissing hands to the Madonna in Farm Street or Westminster Cathedral. But, on the other hand, does any English Catholic seriously suggest that Benediction or the Quarant'Ore or other developments of Eucharistic cultus should be summarily "short-circuited" as comparatively recent importations? In England there has been much talk of a reversion to what is called Benedictine mysticism. Now, as Father Faber¹ says, "no one can be at all acquainted with the old-fashioned Benedictine school of writers without perceiving and admiring the beautiful liberty of spirit which pervades and possesses their whole mind." This is equally true of post-Reformation Benedictines, such as Father Baker; the question is not one of chronology at all. But if it is implied that, say, Jesuit spirituality, or Dominican or Franciscan or Carmelite, is somehow unsuited to Englishmen, whereas that of St. Gregory the Great (who wasn't an Englishman) "will fit a great many English minds to-day,"² then liberty of spirit is being, not extended, but arbitrarily restricted. There have, of course, been writers who have tried to mechanize holiness and to mould the soul artificially; against such, the post-Reformation St. Francis de Sales is a gentle antidote. But this does not justify the other extreme of short-circuiting all ascetical writers subsequent to 1535. More recent multiplication of devotions is not meant to fetter us but to enlarge our area of choice. Benedictinism is, thank God, still living and flourishing to-day; there is also, thank God, nothing peculiarly English about it. Those who prefer it need not condemn, say, the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius as "imported." In our Father's house there are many mansions. There are no tariff-walls inside the Church Catholic.

As implied above I should not criticize this mistaken advocacy of a return to pristine English piety, as conceived by the author of "The Mind of the Saints," if it were not that it is part and parcel of a general attempt to explain away

¹ Quoted in "Father Doyle," p. 145.

² "Mind of the Saints," p. 69. One might try the experiment of replacing all later books by St. Gregory's "Dialogues" or "Morals" or "Pastoral Rule"!

the lives of those who cannot be fitted in the Procrustean bed of "common sense": as if they were to Anglicans a stumbling-block, and to English Catholics foolishness. "The majority of canonized saints are peculiar people anyhow."¹ Luckily we have the martyrs: "Of all the saints we must recognize the martyrs as our chief models and examples." The reason is very simple: "If we find much human nature, no thirst for martyrdom, and even a little shrinking from pain and death, we shall know that they were indeed people like ourselves."² Now, it is certainly true of a great number of martyrs that we know a good deal about their death, but little or nothing about their lives. It is consoling to think that many of them were ordinary people whom God strengthened in the hour of conflict. But it is bad psychology to hold such up as our chief models and examples; one might as well appeal to the Good Thief. The very ordinary last sickness of St. Aloysius makes us feel his kin; the last pipe of the Ven. John Kemble is a touch appreciated by lovers of the weed. But we are not thereby uplifted and strengthened; it needs the heroic to do that. And that is what the saints are for: to show us how high human nature can rise, to prove that passion is not unconquerable, to demonstrate that man is a spiritual being. *Si isti, cur non ego?* asked St. Augustine.

Moreover it is bad history to say that the martyrs showed "no thirst for martyrdom." The letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch tell another story: "I long for the beasts." "Allow me to follow the example of the Passion of my God."³ And St. Justin (A.D. 163): "It is our most ardent desire to suffer in the cause of our Saviour Jesus Christ." And Pothinus, the aged bishop of Lyons (A.D. 177): "His eager desire for martyrdom gave him wonderful strength." The Martyrs of Cæsarea under Valerian "already burning with desire to obtain the prize" hurried to the city. And so on; I could mention a dozen more before the end of the third century. But perhaps the English martyrs had no thirst therefor?

¹ "Mind of the Saints," p. 87.

² *Ibid.* pp. 100 f.

³ Rom. v. 2: vi. 3. Mr. Trent (p. 213) objects to my citing Ignatius, for "he is writing in the days of the early martyrs and before the days of mediæval or even Desert mortification." I feel puzzled: would it not be much easier to quote post-mediæval martyrs such as Bl. Charles Spinola? And if I prove that the desire for martyrdom existed in the martyrs of the early Church, have I not only disproved his universal negative and also given a very respectable lineage to the idea that it is worthy of being accepted as "English"?

Even if it were true, what is the point of it all? The universal negative has been disproved: thousands of martyrs longed for martyrdom. Are Englishmen incapable of such heroism? Apparently the writer, opposing himself to the universal instinct of mankind, thinks it more heroic to suffer martyrdom, not rejoicing to suffer for Christ, but in a spirit of duty, because one cannot help it. He would make a bad recruiting-sergeant for heaven; he believes more in conscription!

But anyway, thank God, he is wrong about Englishmen. Bl. Thomas More, he thinks,¹ accepted God's will, and this was "more deeply Christian and like Christ than any asking for martyrdom." But the best authority on the martyr, Father T. E. Bridgett,² takes an entirely different view: "His death was not only willing, it was desired. All the martyrs have accepted death to be faithful to their God, but not all have desired death; at least they have not all, like More, desired it throughout their life." To his daughter the martyr said: "Among all His great benefits heaped upon me so thick, I reckon, upon my faith, my prisonment ever the very chief." And to the Council: "I have not been a man of such holy living as I might be bold to offer myself to death, lest God for my presumption might suffer me to fall."³

And the monks of Charterhouse "were no martyrdom-seekers."⁴ To which we may retort, How do you know? They did not, of course, foolishly or temerarily throw away their lives. But when Bl. Thomas More, from his prison window, saw them going to death, he turned to his daughter and said: "Lo, dost thou not see, Meg, that these blessed Fathers be now as cheerfully going to their deaths as bridegrooms to their marriage?"⁵

"And meanwhile perhaps the reader has been thinking of a band of young martyrs who did seem to have a real enthusiasm for martyrdom and who could easily have saved their skins if they had wished. We mean the seminary priests and Jesuits."⁶ The author seems actually to consider it necessary to apologize for them for not skin-saving! "Their longing

¹ "Mind of the Saints," p. 128.

² "Life and Writings of Bl. Thomas More" (1904³), p. 431. By the way, during the last five days of his life—in spite of his many ailments—he redoubled his penitential exercises (p. 427). Was this perchance to "keep fit"?

³ "Last Letters of Bl. Thomas More," ed. W. Campbell, 1924, pp. 78, 113.

⁴ "Mind of the Saints," p. 103.

⁵ Bridgett, p. 404.

⁶ "Mind of the Saints," pp. 131 f.

paradox, one could scarcely imagine an attempt so improbable as the effort to fit Father Doyle into this theory. But it has been done in all seriousness. It is claimed that before he died he saw "that all the self-chosen and self-inflicted sufferings were but a pious game after all." His last letters "reveal a return to the golden age of his spiritual life," that is, the period of his Long Retreat when he is alleged to have held that providential circumstances might be relied upon to provide sufficient unavoidable mortification.¹ This is the Retreat during which Father Doyle wrote, "Jesus asks from me the sacrifice of all the pleasures of the world," during which he felt "a growing hunger and thirst for suffering and mortification," at the end of which he resolved to make daily 1,000 ejaculations and 30 little acts of mortification and to bear little sufferings without seeking relief. A golden age, perhaps; but its metal was never quarried in "the Mind of the Saints," where all this is just "a pious game."

And the proof of his return to "public-school" sanity at the Front! He tells his sister that he lets everyone "walk on him." So "he has rediscovered the Third Degree!" presumably because he did not walk on himself.² And he said that he strongly felt that he was "going through a kind of noviceship, a sort of spiritual training." Hence "he seems to have shifted the emphasis from the question of his own sanctification to the question of external work to be done."³ As if, for a Jesuit, there is any such clear-cut distinction. Even in his noviceship Father Doyle resolved "to become a lover of souls, to become holy, this first and foremost, because the Jesuit without sanctity is no true son of Ignatius." And, long before the War, his striving for "his own sanctification" resulted in strenuous and fruitful work for souls. It seems to be hinted that this alleged shift of emphasis resulted in a reaction against "self-inflicted mortifications." We must not, of course, state "anything so crude and impossible." It would not do to put it so bluntly; "the point is connected with very fine shades of perception, of a delicate reorientation of a great and finely-balanced soul, of a dimly-perceived sense of new values scarcely as yet worked

¹ "Mind of the Saints," pp. 97, 213.

² *Ibid.* pp. 98, 214. It seems really necessary to make the very elementary remark that when Father Doyle let his servant "walk on him" and so did without dinner, he did an extremely positive act of "self-inflicted mortification."

³ *Ibid.* p. 215.

out in explicit thought and word."¹ Why all this circumlocution? Why this talk of a delicate reorientation in an unspecified direction, this mysterious hint of new values not otherwise described? And is not the admission—made in reply to a letter of mine in the *Sower*—that no explicit thought or word of Father Doyle can be quoted in support of the original contention,—merely a rather ungenerous camouflage covering a retreat before my challenge to produce the evidence?²

Let us for a moment consider the exegesis. There is in the Letters of St. Ignatius (written during his journey to Rome where he was martyred under Trajan, *circa* 108 A.D.) an extraordinary parallel to the phrases of Father Doyle, written while he too was on the road to martyrdom. "I am slowly learning the lesson Jesus brought me out here to teach me," wrote Father Doyle.³ "The first and greatest is that I must have no will of my own, only His, and this in all things." "Now I am learning in my bonds to give up all desires," wrote St. Ignatius.⁴ "I feel, oh, so strongly, that I am going through a kind of noviceship, a sort of spiritual training," wrote Father Doyle. And St. Ignatius: "I am becoming all the more a disciple for their misdeeds. . . . Only now am I beginning to be a disciple." "I am not yet perfect in Jesus Christ, for only now am I beginning to be a disciple and I am speaking to you as my fellow-pupils; for I needed to be anointed [trained like an athlete] by you in faith, encouragement, endurance, patience."⁵ Clearly, Ignatius let his captors "walk" on him, though "they became worse for kind treatment"; he felt he was only then beginning to serve his discipleship or noviceship and to abandon all desires. Which did not in the least prevent him

¹ "Mind of the Saints," p. 211.

² It is equally disingenuous to suppress in the book without intimation to the reader the statement in the *Sower* (April 1926, p. 68) to which I objected. It is Father Doyle's alleged change of outlook on self-inflicted mortifications "which makes his Life a useful contribution to ascetical literature." That is, the only ascetical value of my book consists in this dimly-perceived delicate reorientation contained in a chance letter to his sister. And it was left to Mr. C. V. Trent to discover this on p. 467 of the Life; but he has never quite explained what *is* the discovery, except that it is "fairer" to Father Doyle. I would like also to point out that on p. 96 Mr. Trent has silently omitted another phrase to which I objected: "He set out on a programme of self-torture that, as a deliberate programme, cannot be justified." The suppression of the italicised words is another unacknowledged concession to my criticism.

³ "Father W. Doyle," p. 467; cited by Mr. Trent (pp. 213 f.) to prove something or other.

⁴ Rom. iv. 3.

⁵ Rom. v. 1: v. 3; Ephes. iii. 1.

from longing for the beasts and from wishing to be poured out to God or ground to death as a victim; nor is it implied that his attitude to suffering was merely passive. "Let us be imitators of the Lord," he writes,¹ "and seek who may suffer the more wrong, be the more destitute, the more despised."

So Father Doyle was true to his life-long ideals when he was Chaplain at the Front. He increased his daily "aspirations" from the 1,000 of the Long Retreat to incredible totals; from bearing little sufferings without relief, he bore big ones; he felt the "constant urging of Jesus to do hard things for Him"; in the last entry in his diary (three weeks before his death) he again offered himself "to Jesus as His victim." *Nos insensati* . . . Why drag in this heroic and utterly consistent Irish Jesuit as a means of bolstering up an alleged English reconstruction of "the mind of the saints"?

Substantially, Catholic asceticism is directly derived from the Gospel and is inspired by the love of Christ. The one motive finds the one consistent expression—self-immolation in order to "put on" the Beloved. I am glad that the "Life of Father Doyle" has emphasized this fact, in face of ill-advised attempts to nationalize what is Catholic.

ALFRED O'RAHILLY.

¹ Ephes. x. 3. Perilously near to the "spirit [apart from morbid excesses] of holy rivalry in self-torture, like the Fathers of the Desert," so abhorrent to "The Mind of the Saints" (p. 31).

MARY WARD'S GREAT ENTERPRISE

I.

AS well by her own character and career, as by the events attaching to her name after her death, Mary Ward stands out as one of the most interesting figures in the English Counter-Reformation. Though she lived most of her life and accomplished all her work while the Stuarts ruled in England, she belongs by her temperament and the distinguishing qualities of mind and heart to the reign of the last Tudor. The splendid virility of her character, her courage and fortitude, her spirit of enterprise and tenacity of purpose, are all akin to the vigour and hardihood and love of high adventure that we associate, rightly or wrongly, with the age of Elizabeth. But in her, as in none of those secular worthies glorified by a warped Protestant tradition, these eminent qualities were directed to the noblest ends, allied themselves with a profound humility and found their stay and support in a trust in God that never wavered, and in a love that dominated all. She too was a pioneer and, like many such, met with constant opposition, expressed at times in calumny and misrepresentation, the influence of which in the suppression of her first Institute has not always, perhaps, been sufficiently emphasized. This opposition pursued her even after the latter event and would have crushed her efforts to re-organize her work on lines allowed by the Pope; but her courage and resource defeated her opponents, and the Institute of Mary with its two hundred and five houses and nearly six thousand members exists to-day as the monument of her victory. Yet though her work survived and prospered, her own good name was under a cloud for years: the Bull *Quamvis Iusto* of Benedict XIV.¹ reproached her with disobedience to the Holy See and forbade her spiritual daughters to call her their Foundress. It was only in 1909 that Pius X. withdrew this prohibition by a special decree,² which, though it is far from being in any way a

¹ April 30th, 1749. Bull. Rom. Luxembourg Edit. 12. p. 30.

² Decree of April 6th. Letter of Cardinal Vives announcing it, April 20th, 1909.

full rehabilitation, is yet of more significance than the mere correction of a measure ordered for practical reasons; for it has opened the way to a new appreciation. Already the results of it may be seen in the praises of Mary Ward uttered by Cardinal Merry del Val and by Pope Pius XI. himself, on the occasion of the tercentenary of the Munich house of the Institute, and still more in the active measures now being taken for the introduction of her cause for beatification.

As already said, the Bull *Quamvis Justo* of Benedict XIV. represents her as in open rebellion against the decree of suppression¹ ordered by Pope Urban VIII. In Treves, it states, when the nuncio attempted to carry out the decree, "there appeared a certain woman named Campian who, calling herself visitor and in virtue of letters-patent from the pretended General-superior, opposed his efforts with great force and contention. For Mary, being still in Rome, as soon as she understood the purport of the Pope's orders, determined to hinder their taking effect to the utmost of her power and sent encyclical letters to her followers everywhere, telling them not to obey." Hence after the quiet suppression of certain houses secretly founded in Bologna, Fossombrone,² and Rome, the Pope brought the entire affair before the Cardinals of the Holy Office. By their advice Mary and Campian were imprisoned in Belgium, whither the former had betaken herself, then brought to Rome, whence, after an imprisonment of longer duration, but—thanks to the Pope's clemency—of milder form, she was allowed to return to Belgium for health's sake, a permission which she used to make an unauthorized journey to England. On account of these happenings her Institute was completely uprooted and destroyed by the Bull of Urban VIII.

In this account there are many omissions and errors. To name only some that are certainly such: the house at Trier (Treves) was not suppressed by the nuncio but by the suffragan bishop of the city: there were no houses of the Institute at Bologna and Fossombrone: Mary Ward was imprisoned, not in Belgium—where she had not been for

¹ i.e., The decree of Propaganda, 1628: not the Bull, *Pastoralis Romani Pontificis*, of Urban VIII.

² The Latin name in the Bull is Forosempronii. Father Grisar—I do not know on what authority—calls this town Foligno. Moroni (*Dizionario* xxvi. 20) and Chevalier (Topo-Bibliographie 1149) give Fossombrone as its Italian equivalent.

years, but in Munich, and there too was set free by order of Urban VIII., journeyed to Rome of her own accord and was received by the Pope with veneration and honour: and so far was her journey to England from being unauthorized, that she took with her a letter of recommendation to the English Queen, written by the Pope's nephew, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the Protector of England.¹

How the apparently open rebellion may be understood and how the suppression of her first Institute was brought about Father Grisar has shown recently in two excellent articles,² based on sources used hitherto only in part. But before we follow his guidance on these matters we must first sketch briefly the chain of events that led up to them.

Mary Ward was a daughter of an old English family of Yorkshire that, on many occasions in those days of severe persecution, had proved its fidelity to the Faith. After a girlhood of singular virtue and piety she felt the call of God, and in 1606 at the age of twenty-one passed over to Flanders to embrace the religious life. Finding, however, by experiment and by a divine intimation that God did not intend her to be either a lay-sister in the Belgian convent of Poor Clares at St. Omer, or a choir-nun of the same order in the house of her own foundation at Gravelines, she returned to England, sorely afflicted by the uncertainty in which she was placed as regards God's will. Some months followed which she spent in zealous work for souls, at the end of which time, having gathered around her a band of devoted companions, she once more crossed over to Flanders and settled her small community at St. Omer. There, while adopting a regular plan of life, she established a boarding school for the daughters of English Catholics, as well as a day school for the young girls of the town. Though by this time she seems to have been certain that God did not call her to a contemplative order, "she was still in great anguish and anxiety of mind," writes her companion and biographer,³ "not knowing the precise will of God concerning the state of life she was to settle in." Her friends and advisers endeavoured to help her but only increased her trouble: "great instance was made by divers spiritual and learned men," she

¹ Dated August 28, 1638. Printed in the *Istanza* (1892), p. 23, doc. 19.

² "Stimmen der Zeit," April, May, 1927.

³ Winefred Wigmore, cited by Chambers, "Life of Mary Ward," i. 267.

herself informs us,¹ "that we would take upon us some rule already confirmed. Several rules were procured by our friends both from Italy and France and we earnestly urged to make choice of some of them. They seemed not that which God would have done, and the refusal of them caused much persecution and this the more because I denied all and could not say what in particular I desired or found myself called to." In this painful extremity she and her companions had recourse to frequent prayer and very rigorous austerities to obtain light from God. After months of weary waiting their prayers were answered. She herself describes the occurrence in her letter to the Nuncio already cited. "In the year 1611," having recovered somewhat from a dangerous illness, "being alone in some extraordinary repose of mind I heard distinctly, not by sound of voice but intellectually understood, these words 'Take the same of the Society.' These few words gave so great measure of light in that particular Institute, comfort and strength and changed so the whole soul, as that it is impossible for me to doubt but that they came from Him whose words are works."²

By them, she understood,—not that God wished her to establish a second branch of the Jesuits subject to that Society in the way that the Poor Clares and the 2nd Order of St. Dominic are subject to the Franciscans and Dominicans,—such a project she never once envisaged in the whole course of her history,—but that He intended her to found a new Congregation of women who were to be actively engaged in education and what other work for souls was possible for them, and to follow—without being in any way dependent on it—the Rules and Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, in so far as they were applicable to women. And the conviction that God had thus manifested His will,—conviction that no opposition could ever shake,—explains the tenacity of purpose with which she pursued her aim, no matter what suffering and obloquy it brought upon her.

¹ In her letter to the Nuncio Albergati written some years later. Chambers, i. 277-8. In her Italian autobiography she says of these sufferings: "None the less do I consider it certain that there can be no greater trouble than doubt concerning God's will, when anyone has made the firm resolution to seek God alone and to serve Him. But I would not desire that the knowledge of the Divine will should have cost me less. I equally cannot be sufficiently astonished at the imperfection of those who would in this way buy it so cheap." Quoted in *THE MONTH*, July, 1880, p. 377.

² Letter to Nuncio: Chambers, i. 283.

Opposition, indeed, was not slow in showing itself. The Jesuits, with their papal exemption from, and their traditional aversion to, the direction of convents, naturally viewed the project with suspicion. "My confessor resisted;" she writes, "all the Society opposed."¹ She was commanded—and prudently so—"to lay aside both her thoughts and her institute and she obeyed without delay." Efforts were made to persuade her to take another rule: "divers institutes were drawn by several persons, some of which were approved and greatly commended by the last Bishop Blasius of St. Omer, our great friend, and some other divines: these were offered us; there was no remedy, but refuse them which caused infinite troubles."² For a time she seems to have stood almost alone in upholding her plans. Gradually, however, her calm confidence and holy life prevailed and gained adherents for them. Amongst these, Bishop Blaise, who had always shown himself a good friend to the new community, seems to have been the first. Her confessor, too, though he continued for some time to maintain a certain resistance,—chiefly owing to pressure brought to bear upon him by his brethren—became convinced that she was being guided by God and ultimately favoured her project. She was now allowed to study the Rules and Constitutions of the Society in an English version.

Meanwhile, the community had increased considerably in numbers and a house was opened in London. A residence there was most desirable as several of the members had to return to England from time to time to obtain the payment of their dower and of the pensions of the children entrusted to them, as well as to seek for and bring back fresh pupils. It soon, however, became a centre of Catholic activity; two priests were constantly lodged there, and the "sisters" helped in their work for souls by visiting and instructing the poor and preparing them for confession, so that the priests might avoid the danger that a longer stay in their homes would occasion.

From her study of the Jesuit rule Mary Ward now drew up in writing a sketch of her new Institute, which was submitted to Bishop Blaise. Having examined it attentively, he warmly commended it. The opinion, too, of various Jesuit theologians was sought, for in his letter of 1615 the Bishop

¹ Letter to Nuncio Albergati: Chambers, i. 290.

² *Ibid.*: Chambers, i. 291.

writes, "we have seen the letters and testimonials of the leading Fathers, of their most distinguished and, we may add, their most learned men from Italy, Spain, France, Germany, England and Belgium, all of whom agree in highly extolling the Institute."¹ Two of these letters have come down to us, namely those of Lessius and Suarez²—answering the three questions regarding it: "Is it lawful and holy? Is it in the power of a bishop to approve and confirm it? Ought the Institute to be held to constitute a state, so that those who embrace it may be considered to have accepted a fixed and stable manner of life?"

The opinion of Lessius was most favourable. Not only was the Institute lawful and holy, but of untold advantage to England: its non-continuance would be a serious loss to the Church. As it was only a pious Institute with simple vows, it did not come under the decrees of the Councils of Lateran (IV.) and Lyons (II.), prohibiting the erection of new religious Orders, and could therefore be approved and confirmed by the bishop under whose jurisdiction it would remain. Its members were not and did not claim to be Religious, yet their way of life was hardly to be distinguished from that of a religious Order, wanting merely the extrinsic approbation of the Pope, and it had the advantages of such; the obligation of perpetual observance being, before God, no less firm in the case of simple vows than in that of solemn.

Lessius' opinion is interesting and worthy of notice as being favourable to that type of religious life which has become so widespread and so fruitful in modern times,—viz., active congregations of women with simple vows and without enclosure. They were for a century and a half after Lessius' death merely tolerated by the Holy See. In view of this and of the later history of Mary Ward's Institute, it may be well to record his judgment on what has been regarded as its chief novelty, viz., the absence of enclosure: "*Praecipua ratio, cur istae virgines non ingrediantur aliquam Religionem antiquam et probatam, est quia praecipuus finis, quam sibi propositum habent, impediretur, nempe, educatio et institutio*

¹ Cited by Chambers, i. 322.

² The letter of Suarez is printed in his "*Opera Omnia*," Brussels edition. T. XI., Pt. II., p. 357, and is dated June 5th, 1615. A copy of Lessius' letter—made from that in the Munich Archives—is at Farm Street. It is without date; but as the beginning, giving the "*Status Quaestionis*," is *verbatim* the same as that of Suarez, I conclude it belongs to the same date as the latter. The first portion of both was apparently part of a circular letter sent to the theologians mentioned by Bishop Blaise.

filiarum Nobilium quae ex illo regno mittuntur: haec enim cum clausura et choro consistere non possunt. Accedit quod interdum in Angliam, negotiorum causa, sit illis excurrendum, ut fructum, quem sibi propositum habent, consequentur. Denique nulla est Religio feminarum quae similem sibi scopum habeat: omnes enim sibi vacant non proximo. Itaque cederet in magnum Ecclesiae et illius regni detrimentum, si omisso tali proposito et Instituto, aliquam ex illis Religionibus ingrederentur." This strikes a much more modern note than the opinion of the conservative Suarez, and perhaps was not uninfluenced by his knowledge of the difficulties to be met with in a country affected with heresy, and by his acquaintance with the Beguins who still flourished in Belgium.¹

The opinion of Suarez² was much more cautious. He had nothing, indeed, but praise for the end and the general means of the Institute. In itself it was a holy way of life. But if the decrees of the above-mentioned Councils were not to be wholly nugatory, they must extend to such a congregation as this, the approbation of which by the Pope would at once make its members religious. Without such approbation the Institute was unlawful. There were, moreover, specially urgent reasons for submitting it to the Pope for examination:—its members took the three vows of religion yet did not vow nor observe enclosure: such a practice might be permitted indeed for grave reasons, but it had been condemned by the Popes and many decrees, and was rendered all the more dangerous by the fact that these ladies had to travel up and down England. They were further to engage

¹ Cf. "De judicio R.P.F. Suarez," in his "Opera Omnia," Brussels. T. XI., Pt. II., p. 355. On the Beguins cf. Helyot, "Histoire des Ordres Religieux." Paris, 1721. T. VIII., pp. 5, 6. Thomassin, "Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina." T. II., LIII., c. lxiii., § xi.

² Biographers of Mary Ward have cited Suarez as in favour of the Institute. His opinion, however, can hardly be called a favourable one. His praise of the Institute occupies but one short paragraph in a letter that takes up ten columns of print; is very general in character, amounting to little more than praise of the religious life as applied to women engaged in teaching, etc. Moreover, this very letter seems to have been used by the opponents against the Institute; the Nuncio reporting to Ingoli, Secretary of Propaganda, Liège, Nov. 22, 1630, that he has got into his hands the writing of Fr. Suarez, S.J., in which he says the Institute of the Virgins cannot exist: and telling the Secretary to use all diligence to see it in the Professed House or in the College; if he finds difficulty, he can have it from him. "Prop. Arch. Lett. di Spagna. Portug.," etc., Vol. 98, f. 187. Further, the decree cited and the reasons alleged for the suppression in the Bull of Pope Urban are the same as those to be found in this letter of Suarez.

in apostolic work,—a proceeding unfitting for women and hardly consonant with the teaching of St. Paul and the sacred canons. The Pope's approbation was therefore imperative: a bishop had no competence in the matter. The want of papal approval would take away from the Institute all character of stability; for it would be contrary to the law: in consequence the superior could have no legitimate authority, and the vows, especially that of obedience, could have no power to oblige its members to live permanently under its rule.¹

Suarez' reasoning certainly appears the more cogent. His opinion that Institutes with simple vows came under the decrees of the Councils and therefore needed the approval of the Holy See for their valid erection, was the common one at the time. From the contrary practice, however, in the case of these Institutes, was derived the prescriptive right of bishops to approve and confirm such religious congregations. Influenced by the Constitution ("*Circa Pastoralis*," 29 May, 1566) of St. Pius V., who would have no religious communities of women exist except under solemn vows and with papal enclosure, the Holy See for centuries merely tolerated those uncloistered Institutes with simple vows, which arose to meet new needs occasioned by changing circumstances. These therefore had recourse to the bishops for approval. Leo XIII., in his Constitution "*Conditae*," 8 Dec. 1900, formally recognized this prescriptive right of bishops, and Pius X., in his *Motu Proprio* "*Dei Providentia*," 16 July, 1906, whilst confirming it, added the restriction that leave of the Holy See must first be obtained. This legislation has passed into the present Code of Canon Law.²

The opinions of these two distinguished theologians could not but have made clearer the necessity of obtaining papal approbation for the new Institute: to the one its continued existence depended on it, to both the character of its members as religious. The persistent opposition, moreover, which

¹ "Ideoque nos e contrario dicimus, quamvis illud institutum ex suis votis satis ad statum religiosum esse possit, si tamen temere usurpetur contra prohibitionem pontificis, eo ipso statum non esse, cum sit contra legem, contra quam nihil potest esse firmum et stabile, nec vota illa maxime obedientiae obligare possunt ad permanendum in tali vivendi modo cum sit illicitus; et quia superior est electa sine interventu auctoritatis pontificiae non potest esse legitima. . ." *L.c.*, p. 360.

² Can. 492, § 1. Cf. Vermeersch, "*De Religiosis*" (1907-9 ed.), I., pp. 49, 50: II. Monumenta (for the documents). Bouix, "*De Jure Regularium*," T. I., pp. 193—222. Bizzarri, "*Collectanea*," p. 456.

it had aroused and which had manifested its effects even within the community, would by itself have made such a step expedient. A long Memorial was accordingly drawn up in Latin and sent to Rome late in 1615. This document, a copy of which is still preserved in the Jesuit archives, affords us an admirable sketch of the projected Institute.

The moving cause of the undertaking is the afflicted state of heretical England, and the object to aid, as far as women can, in the great work of its conversion. The members, therefore, propose to follow a mixed kind of life, keeping always in view the two great ends—their own perfection and the salvation of their neighbour. It is to comprise four degrees,—novices, lay-Assistants, Mistresses and the Professed who are to be called Mothers. The noviceship lasts two years, at the close of which, those who have persevered therein, take the three simple—and apparently perpetual—vows, are thereby incorporated into the congregation and become religious. The Mistresses renew their vows twice a year, spending some days previously in recollection. Before being promoted to the higher degree of Professed, which is to be at the will of the chief Superior, they are to pass through a second noviceship lasting six months or a whole year. When that is completed they make their profession, publicly taking the vows—apparently solemn—of religion and adding privately certain other vows such as never to make any change in the Institute. The government of the whole congregation, which is to have the power of dismissing unsuitable members even after profession, is to be committed to a chief superior aided by her Assistants. Finally, exemption from any jurisdiction save that of the Pope is earnestly desired, and non-enclosure regarded as an absolute necessity.

From this very brief summary the traits of the Jesuit Constitutions, though they are never once mentioned, stand out clearly. The chief differences, too, from existing Orders of women are noteworthy:—the division into four grades and the power of dismissal, government under one chief Superior, exemption from all but papal jurisdiction, and, above all, the absence of enclosure. This latter indeed was, some years later, to prove the real stumbling-block to approval and even to toleration. It was not the mere freedom from enclosure in itself,—but the extent of that freedom and

its association with solemn vows.¹ Non-enclosure, indeed, had been and was tolerated in the Franciscan Tertiaries and other congregations with simple vows, but an uncloistered religious Order, strictly so-called, was far more directly opposed to the spirit that had guided papal legislation since the "Circa Pastoralis" of St. Pius V.² Truly, Mary Ward lacked not courage in making such a petition.

And yet,—after three months came back the Pope's answer, not, it is true, definitely approving the new Institute, but warmly commending it to the care of the Bishop that "its members may daily produce more abundant fruit of their labours," and holding out hopes, if so, of later confirmation. Mary's courage had certainly scored an initial success.

LEO HICKS.

(To be continued.)

¹ Even by the present discipline of the Church there must be papal enclosure where there are solemn vows, though one exception has certainly been made. Cf. Bizzarri, *op. cit.* pp. 455 : 538 ff : 778 ff : on clausura, cf. Vermeersch, *op. cit.* T. II., "Monumenta," pp. 210 ff : Bouix, *op. cit.* T. II., c. 8.

² As, for instance, the Ursulines of Dole. Cf. Helyot, *op. cit.* IV. 212 :—Most of the various Ursuline foundations eventually became orders in the strict sense. *Ibid.* IV., pp. 150 ff. Heimbucher. O. Die Orden und Kongregationen Der Katholischen Kirche, Vol. II. 278 ff.

BLESSED BERNADETTE'S PATH TO HOLINESS

FEBRUARY 11th, 1928, will be the seventieth anniversary of the apparition of Our Lady at the Grotto of Massabielle.¹ For twenty years past this feast has been kept with the rank of a "greater double" throughout the Universal Church. No doubt we cannot, with the example of such annual celebrations as those of September 24th or May 8th before our eyes,¹ treat the mere inclusion in the Roman Calendar as constituting of itself a decisive proof of the reality and supernatural character of the incident commemorated. But it must not be forgotten that a commission appointed by the Bishop of Tarbes, after an investigation which lasted more than three years, returned a definitely favourable report regarding the "événements de Lourdes," in virtue of which an episcopal pronouncement was published in the following terms: "Our judgment is that Mary Immaculate, the Mother of God, really appeared to Bernadette Soubirous on 11 February, 1858, and on other days afterwards (eighteen times in all), in the Grotto of Massabielle, near the Town of Lourdes, that this apparition bears every indication of genuineness, and that the Faithful are justified in believing it to be a fact."

This conclusion is very much strengthened by the circumstance that Bernadette lived for another seventeen years after the pronouncement referred to, and that unlike the normal subject of hysterical hallucinations she never again claimed to have experienced any sort of vision or preternatural manifestation. Moreover, her conduct during these years of frail health and absolute self-effacement was such as to merit for her the repute of heroic virtue, a repute formally confirmed upon sworn testimony in the canonical process of her beatification.

But even apart from the interest which attaches to the beginnings of what is now the most famous shrine in Christendom

¹ The feast of Sept. 24th recalls the memory of an alleged vision of Our Lady which is believed to have led to the foundation of the Order for the Redemption of Captives. That of May 8th is said to have been occasioned by an apparition of St. Michael the Archangel. In both cases an unreserved acceptance of the legend is vetoed by serious historical difficulties.

there are circumstances which make the story of Bernadette almost unique in the annals of sanctity. Hardly ever has it happened before that a servant of God has been subjected in childhood to the supreme test of a boundless veneration paid her by her elders and by visitors from afar.¹ Moreover, in this case the poor girl, by reason of her youth, her poverty and her ignorance, stood almost defenceless before the importunities of those who were not only indiscreet, but often patronizing and even mercenary. Though many lives of Bernadette have been written, it has long seemed to me that this very curious aspect of the case has never been sufficiently thrown into relief. Indeed, it is only through the recent publication of the materials so painstakingly gathered up by the late Père Louis Cros that adequate information has become available. This must be my excuse for reverting once more to that author's invaluable "*Histoire de Notre-Dame de Lourdes*" and gleaningsome few details from the depositions which he has made public. We cannot expect to know very much of Bernadette's convent life, and there would, in any case, be little to record about her faithful observance of the routine of community duties. But before her entrance, on July 8, 1866, into the Institut des Sœurs de la Charité de Nevers, nearly 300 miles from Lourdes, she can have enjoyed little real peace, however anxious her best friends, ecclesiastical and secular, may have been to protect her from intrusion.

Despite the disrepute into which the Soubirous family had fallen and despite the moral failings which had undoubtedly helped to reduce the father and mother to their condition of extreme poverty, it seems clear that they had by no means lost their sense of self-respect. André Sajoux, a cousin of Bernadette's mother, who was not at all blind to her shortcomings, declared that "Louise and her children would have died of hunger sooner than beg."² If this was the feeling in the household as a whole the never-ceasing attempts to press money and other gifts upon them must have been a constant mortification to the sensitive child whose visions had served

¹ Whatever may be thought of the alleged apparition of Our Lady at La Salette to the two children, Mélanie and Maximin, in 1846, it is certain that the subsequent career of both one and the other was extremely unsatisfactory. Maximin seems to have given up altogether for a long time the practice of his religion, and Mélanie passed a most erratic existence in the course of which she claimed to have been the subject of many supernatural manifestations which very few of those who came in contact with her were prepared to treat seriously.

² Cros, "*Histoire de Notre-Dame de Lourdes*." Paris: Beauchesne. 1926. Vol. II., p. 51.

to draw attention to their poverty. The same André Sajoux, whom I have just quoted, told Père Cros at a later date :—

If Bernadette had not forbidden us to accept presents, I might have been one of the richest men in Lourdes. People would have given me a great deal. On one occasion a party of gentlemen from Pau offered me a handful of gold. There were three of them and they came to our house at about two o'clock in the morning. Bernadette was asleep. They brought with them a big girl who had long been ill. They wanted Bernadette to kiss her, to lay her hands on her breast. Bernadette, out of all patience, told them : "*N'oum cargui pas de gari, laba lo d'ab aïgo de la grotto*" (I don't undertake to cure people, wash her with the water of the grotto). When they left, I escorted them to the door and it was there that they offered me so much money ; but I took nothing.¹

Even as early as 7 May, 1858, the Procureur Général in an official despatch to the Préfet, which is still preserved, paid a tribute to Bernadette's absolute disinterestedness. "So far," he wrote, "from soliciting any form of help or encouraging offers of this kind, she has always rejected them."² A month later M. Peyramale, the parish priest of Lourdes, sending in his report to the Bishop, speaks of a lady from another part of France who had come to see Bernadette, and tells how the visitor had persisted in offering her money. "The child," he goes on, "refused it again and again and showed that her feelings were hurt," and he adds : "it is a marvel in the moral order to see how this child of the people, so poor that she often has not even bread to eat, refuses with such true dignity the offers that are constantly made to her." Only a few weeks afterwards we hear of two French bishops, the Bishop of Montpellier and the Bishop of Soissons, each of whom came independently to Lourdes to interview Bernadette, and to each of whom the idea had occurred of wishing to exchange his own richly-mounted rosary for that of the humble voyante. It is Jacomet himself, the Commissaire de Police, who reports to the Préfet on July 22nd, that his Lordship of Montpellier, in spite of repeated appeals had been unable to persuade Bernadette to accept the rosary he pressed

¹ Cros, II., p. 50 note.

² *Ib.* p. 85.

upon her,¹ and Monseigneur de Soissons, if we may trust M. Estrade, was equally unsuccessful. But it would seem that similar attempts were renewed almost daily.

According to the testimony of all who were in any way brought into personal contact with Bernadette, she never referred to the apparitions, unless she was directly questioned about them. At the same time her innumerable visitors certainly did not spare her, and the accounts which they themselves wrote down after the cross-examinations to which she was subjected leave a strange impression of the obtuseness and want of delicacy displayed by many of the ecclesiastics who apparently thought that their sacerdotal character invested them with inquisitorial powers in regard to any child of her age who was presumptuous enough to believe that she had had a supernatural experience. Take such a passage as the following, which is only an extract from a much longer interrogatory which Père Cros has preserved for us :—

Did Our Lady speak to you often?—Yes, M. l'Abbé.
Every time?—No, not every time.

Did she tell you any secrets?—Yes, M. l'Abbé.
How many?—Three.

The newspapers reported that you said there were four.—No, she only told me three.

These secrets were for you?—Yes, M. l'Abbé.

They only concern you?—Yes, M. l'Abbé.

The secrets have nothing to do with anybody except yourself?—No, M. l'Abbé.

Will you make these secrets known some day or other?—If Our Lady wishes me to, yes.

And how will you know if Our Lady wishes you to?—She will let me know; she will tell me.

Then it is not certain that you are to tell them?—No, M. l'Abbé.

I suppose the secret is that she taught you the surest way of getting to Heaven?—Ah, they are secrets; if I told you, they would be secrets no longer.

Don't be afraid, we have no desire to know them.

It should be observed that during this long interview, which touched upon a number of other topics, Bernadette, though the season was August, was lying in bed. She had been ill for five days, but she told her questioner that she was

¹ Cros, II., pp. 276—277.

better and that her cough was not so bad that day as to prevent her talking. In any case the worthy Abbé seems to have had no mercy. He asked her whether she herself drank the water of the Grotto, and why it did not cure her, and why Our Lady wanted her to suffer? He was anxious to know whether she still went to Massabielle, and what was the reason the Curé did not allow her to go more frequently—it appears from her reply that she could never be seen walking in that direction without a crowd of people following her,—whether she had not sometimes gone in spite of his prohibition, whether she would still go without his leave if she felt the same strong interior impulse which took her there at the time of the apparitions, whether she had ever seen Our Lady since, whether she had made her first Communion, whether Our Lady had appeared to her when she made her first Communion, how often she now went to Communion, and so on and so on. Not content with this, we learn that the same ecclesiastic came back a fortnight later—it was in August, 1859—bringing with him two other visitors. His curiosity regarding the secrets was still unsatisfied. He asked whether anything in the secrets portended calamity, whether Our Lady had talked to her about a religious vocation, whether she had spoken of Heaven, whether our Lady in addressing her had used *vous* or *tu*—it appears she had always said *vous*,—whether she had spoken patois, and whether she (Bernadette) would be willing to tell the Pope her secrets. All this was again written down at large by the Abbé in question, and it is rather interesting to learn from his notes that Bernadette, when asked about the miracles of healing at the spring, said definitely that though she had heard these things reported, she had neither seen nor known any such marvels. Further, when it was suggested that she herself had contributed to the cure of the sick, she smiled and emphatically repudiated the story as absurd.

During many months, and in fact until Bernadette in 1861 found a refuge with the nuns at the Hospice, this sort of thing seems often to have gone on all day and every day. In particular the poor child was continually being pestered about her secrets. Some told her that she was doing wrong in not disclosing them to her confessor, others insinuated that a revelation which could not be made known to anyone was a very useless sort of revelation. Others again

wanted to know whether she had heard anything about the secrets which were supposed to have been communicated by the apparition at La Salette, and it appears from Bernadette's reply that she knew nothing of La Salette until long afterwards. Her questioners extracted the information that the secrets had not been imparted on the same day but on different days, and they learnt that though they had been spoken in patois the Blessed Virgin's accent had appeared to the child to be very refined.¹

Perhaps the most interesting and illuminating document contained in Père Cros' two later volumes is the account furnished by Sœur Victorine, to whose special charge Bernadette had been confided, of the period of her residence at the Hospice, 1861—1866. Although the child, who had now passed her seventeenth birthday, was here protected in some measure from the importunities to which she had been exposed when she lived at home with her family, there were still many visitors to whom it was impossible to deny admission.

Bernadette [Sœur Victorine states] nearly always shrank from the task of replying to the questions of those who came to see her, if only on account of the fatigue which these conversations entailed. Every effort of this sort told upon her chest and was liable to bring on a bad attack of asthma. When I took her down to the parlour, I used to see her come to a standstill near the door, and the tears, big heavy drops, welled up into her eyes—"Come," I would say to her, "be brave."—Then she wiped away the tears, came into the room, bade a pleasant welcome to her visitors and answered everything she was asked, without a hint of impatience at their importunate questions or showing irritation when her word was doubted.

The same account goes on to say that she never spoke of the apparitions, or led up to the subject, unless she was directly asked, and in answering she added nothing beyond what was strictly necessary. She showed no sort of vanity or self-complacency when compliments and marks of veneration were paid her. People brought their rosaries and implored her to touch them. In the beginning of her residence

¹ Cros, Vol. II., p. 333.

at the Hospice she used to comply, simply as the easiest way out of the difficulty and to avoid further importunities, but later on, her confessor, the Abbé Pomian, raised objections, and in future she said in answer to such appeals: "I am not allowed to do that."

There were often people [I am still quoting from Sœur Victorine] who threw themselves on their knees before her and asked her to bless them. She told them: "I don't know how." One day she was washing her hands in the kitchen when a priest made his way in, and with him a lady and her children. The priest knelt down and asked Bernadette for her blessing. The poor girl answered "I don't know how to bless." The priest persisted: "Say 'Holy Virgin, who appeared to me, bless this priest and this family'." Bernadette was very much upset, but in all simplicity she repeated the words after him. Once when I was going down to the Grotto with her, I heard somebody behind us remark: "I wonder if I could manage to cut off a bit of her dress." Bernadette turned round and burst out, "How silly you all are!" On certain days the crowd of people who came to see her was so great, and Bernadette was so worn out that we had to group the visitors outside the house and take Bernadette to the window to show her to them. She did as we asked her, even when she was ill, though these public exhibitions distressed her very much. As we went to the window, she said to me one day: "The fact is I am a sort of curio (*une pièce curieuse*)."

So far as matters of devotion went, Sœur Victorine testifies that there was nothing in any way remarkable about her piety at this period. "I used to say to her, 'at your age you surely ought to go to the chapel sometimes and meditate a little.' She only answered: 'It's no good; I don't know how to meditate'." At the same time everyone noticed the extraordinary recollection and modesty which showed itself in her, and more particularly in her manner of making the sign of the cross. She said many rosaries every day and would never be parted from her beads.

Other witnesses speak in the same sense and testify both to the charm, modesty and simplicity which struck every observer, and also to the extravagant veneration of which, much

to her own confusion, she was continually the object. The impression of extreme youthfulness persisted down to the time of her departure for Nevers on July 4, 1866, though she was at that date 22½ years old. A priest who paid a visit to the Hospice in October, 1865, wrote to a friend a few days afterwards:

According to the official register of births Bernadette is more than 21, but it needs an act of faith in the accuracy of these records to believe the fact. One's eyes persist in telling one that she is still the child of thirteen [*lege* 14] that she was on the day of the first apparition. I do not believe it would be possible to find a child of thirteen with a younger face than Bernadette at one and twenty, and her youthfulness has a supernatural charm which no one can fail to be conscious of. . . . The day after (my interview with her) I said Mass at the Hospice. At the Communion the little server said the Confiteor, and I then gave Communion to a child of twelve or thirteen, having an impression that the communicant was no other than Bernadette. But in the momentary glimpse I caught of her features as I placed the Host upon her tongue, I could not make sure, and I ended by persuading myself that it could not be she; it was such a baby face that I had seen.¹

The communicant, however, was really Bernadette, and the priest was able to satisfy himself of the fact in a second talk which he had with her after she had made her thanksgiving.

That Our Lady's messenger had no desire to advertise herself or to thrust herself upon the notice of the great is pleasantly if indirectly evidenced by the account which Père Cros has printed of the visit which Madame l'Amirale Bruat, the governess of the Prince Imperial, paid to Lourdes in July, 1858. It may be remembered that access to the Grotto was at that date still forbidden, and that the visit in question contributed not a little to the removal of the interdict decreed by the civil functionaries. Madame Bruat was accompanied by her three daughters and a nun, and naturally she had expressed a wish to see the child to whom the apparitions had been vouchsafed. If we could suppose that

¹ Cros, Vol. III., p. 181.

Bernadette was a schemer, ambitious of notoriety, this would have been her opportunity. A *grande dame* of the standing of Madame l'Amirale, enjoying the favour of the imperial court, was surely a person to be cultivated. But the little visionary seems to have attached herself to the nun and to have paid no more attention to the great lady than ordinary courtesy required. Mme Bruat herself writes that while Bernadette lavished marks of affection upon Sœur Saint-Antonin, "she showed herself very reserved in her replies to our pious questions." On the other hand, Sœur Saint-Antonin, who also has furnished a written account of the visit, reports that when the child was fetched from her home,

Bernadette, as soon as she caught sight of me, threw herself into my arms, and showed me every mark of affection. She did not speak French, but patois, and consequently her answers to our questions had to be interpreted. There was truly something of heaven in her eyes and I have never forgotten their expression.

I asked her to come to the Grotto with us. "No, no," she replied, "I cannot do that; it has been forbidden." But she added that she would show us the way as far as the bridge; and so she did. As we went along she walked by my side, slipping her arm under mine and keeping tight hold of my hand. When she said good-bye to us, she embraced me very warmly, and pointed out the path we had to follow.¹

The simple and affectionate disposition which peeps out in such an incident seems never to have quite lost its charm. A certain stiff repression of natural feeling, which it is perhaps the tendency of convent life in France to carry to excess, has imparted a somewhat artificial and conventional tone to Bernadette's rare letters,² almost the only personal memorials that survive of her later days. One likes her best when at the Hospice her impatience with the people who sought her out, trying to cut snippets from her dress and locks from her hair, is allowed momentarily to get the better

¹ Cros, Vol. II., p. 302.

² From a letter to her brother Pierre, written, in reply to his remonstrances, some six months before her death, Bernadette declares that she could not bring herself to write because it had come to her knowledge that her letters were being handed about (*il m'a été dit que mes lettres couraient partout*). But she speaks with tender affection and tells him that in reading his appeal her eyes had filled with tears.

of her. *Où que ces dames m'embêtent!* was an outburst which she is recorded to have permitted herself on more than one occasion after a particularly trying interview. If the poor child had felt free to express her entire mind, I do not think she would have limited her protest to the representatives of one sex alone. But she no doubt had scruples about saying anything which might imply a want of respect for the clergy, and few of the male sex, other than ecclesiastics, were able to obtain access to her.

Bernadette was so emphatic and persistent in her repudiation of any kind of supernatural experience, either before the momentous 11th of February, 1858, or in her later years, that her unwavering conviction of the reality of the eighteen apparitions must certainly carry great weight. There are a few minor discrepancies in the details of the accounts she gave at different times,¹ but the substance of her statement never varied in the least, and it must be remembered that the record of the innumerable cross-examinations to which she was subjected began within a few days of her first visit to the Grotto. But no denials of hers could check the evolution of a legend which represented her as the focus even in early childhood of all sorts of preternatural occurrences. Just before the time of the apparitions she had spent a few months at Bartrès, not far off, where she was employed to keep watch over a few sheep and cows. It was, later on, as Père Cros attests, the fond belief of the good people of Bartrès that on one occasion when taking her little flock to pasture she had to cross a pretty broad stream, and that the water divided of itself to give her free passage. Again they said that one day when she had to prepare the dinner she could find nothing to cook but a handful of maize flour, but that at her prayer the flour was multiplied so that everyone had abundance.² Similarly she was credited at Lourdes itself with sundry miraculous cures,³ and people reported at the time of the apparitions that when Bernadette knelt down on the dirty ground her clothes remained unspotted, and that when her candle was broken she had only to pass a moistened finger round it to make it whole again. There seems, however, to be no shadow of foundation for any of these marvels. Even the story which, upon the authority of

¹ See Cros, Vol. I., pp. 414, 456—458; and cf. I., p. 184; and II., p. 31.

² Cros, Vol. I., pp. 61—62.

³ Cros, Vol. II., p. 31 and note.

Dr. Dozous, has been included in every history of the Grotto, that when Bernadette was in ecstasy the candle-flame played upon her hand for a quarter of an hour together without inflicting any injury, is now with good reason rejected by Père Cros as quite unreliable.¹ But with all this, and apart from the apparitions, one consoling fact remains. In spite of the veneration of the crowds, which led them even to kneel down in the street to pray before the wretched hovel where the Soubirous family were then living,² and to chip off pieces of the mantel-shelf to carry away as relics, in spite of all the offers of money and service and the adulation which even great personages were prepared to offer her, Bernadette was never spoiled. As far as in her lay she evaded all notoriety, and she remained to the end the same simple, humble child that she had been at the beginning. Though her heart was always centred in Lourdes she had no part in the celebrations connected with the days of its triumph. The abstention seems to have been in large measure her own voluntary choice; she preferred to efface herself. But who shall say how much the deprivation cost her? There are few speeches in all the annals of sanctity more pathetic than the cry of Bernadette from her cell at Nevers: "Oh! si je pouvais voir sans être vue." "Oh! if only I could see without being seen."

The conjecture suggests itself strongly that one of Bernadette's "secrets" must have been this, that she was never of her own free will to do anything which would attract to herself the notice of men.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ Cros, Vol. I., pp. 494—497.

² This is attested in an official dispatch by Capt. Bourriots, then Lieutenant of Gendarmerie at Argelès, who describes a scene which he himself had witnessed in the rue des Petits-Fossés. Cros, I., p. 367.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE UPSHOT OF "MALINES."

THE long promised report on the "Malines Conversations" ¹ was published on January 19th. Just a week before it appeared, an unofficial, *interim* report on "Points of Agreement" was issued by Lord Halifax, to obviate the "considerable inconvenience" caused by the delay in publishing the full account, due to the Archbishop of Canterbury's wish that the book should not be in the hands of the public till the Revised Prayer Book had been submitted to Parliament. The rejection of the Book seemed to involve a further indefinite postponement and Lord Halifax thought well to fill in the interval by giving us his "Notes," which were written shortly after Cardinal Mercier's death.

It is not improbable that the Archbishop thereupon withdrew his opposition and allowed the Official Report to be published to allay somewhat the Evangelical and Liberal indignation which were likely to be aroused by Lord Halifax's account of "Points of Agreement."

It must be remembered that "Malines" was working professedly for "Corporate Reunion": that what was being there discussed was the possibility of bringing the *Churches* together, and the "schools of thought" whose views were inarticulate at Malines, because all the participants on the Anglican side were "Anglo-Catholics" of a rather advanced type, will necessarily tend to regard much that was said there to the Catholic theologians as a betrayal of the Anglican position.

Before passing on to consider the Report, it is necessary once more to assure Lord Halifax and "Anglo-Catholics" that it was not jealousy of Cardinal Mercier's interest in them which accounted for the admitted lack of enthusiasm, and even at times the opposition, shown by the English Catholic press in regard to the attempts at Malines to further "corporate reunion." Lord Halifax is incorrect in so diagnosing the English Catholic attitude, for it was mainly the policy of silence as to what was passing at Malines to which objection was taken by the present writer and others in the Press. That silence made possible the circulation of mischievous rumours among "Anglo-Catholics," both in England and America, which suggested that the continental Catholic theologians had some esoteric, less ultramontane and more acceptable explanation of the Vatican Decrees than that current in England

¹ "The Conversations at Malines: 1921-1925" (in English and French). Pp. 95. Oxford University Press. Price, 2s. 6d. n.

among Catholics. It was impossible to give proofs of the falsity of such suggestions, because the Catholic participants in the "Conversations" were faithful to the pact of secrecy.

We never doubted for a moment the learning, loyalty or orthodoxy of Cardinal Mercier and his Catholic associates, but we were unable to quote their words in disproof of the calumny. As an illustration we quote here a paragraph from the *Green Quarterly*, an Anglo-Catholic review :—

Our English Roman friends are, for the most part, uncompromisingly ultramontane, while at Malines the explanation of the Papal claims has differed quite as much from the ultramontane, as an Anglo-Catholic interpretation of the 39 Articles differs from, say, that of a moderate and married parish priest.

The *Green Quarterly's* contempt for the "uncatholic views" of the "moderate and married" Anglican parson in this comparison suggests a very considerable divergence of interpretation on the part of ourselves and our continental co-religionists. Still wider circulation to the idea that there were two doctrines on the matter of the Papal claims was given in a leading article in the *Church Times*, commenting on a Farm Street sermon in reply to Lord Halifax's Albert Hall speech in 1925. The preacher's interpretation, given to Lord Halifax's words about "the historic claims of Canterbury," was afterwards repudiated by Lord Halifax, but it was at the time apparently accepted by the *Church Times*, and his repudiation in no way affects the passage. The Editor quotes from the Farm Street sermon :—

Ask any Anglo-Catholic to-day, what are the historic claims of Canterbury? He will reply without hesitation: "We claim to be a part or branch of the Catholic Church to-day and to have real unbroken continuity with the pre-Reformation Church in England and we claim for Canterbury unbroken Apostolic Succession and valid orders." To all this the preacher replied: "These claims must be relinquished by any individual or party or by the whole Church, if they seek reconciliation with Rome."

The editorial comment on this passage was mischievously suggestive of unorthodoxy on the part of the learned and saintly Cardinal Mercier. It ran :—

We will not perpetrate the blunder of committing the Roman Church to the utterance of an individual preacher . . . but there is certainly enough in these utterances to justify an enquiry: which of the two most nearly represents the prevailing Roman spirit: is it the benevolent and venerable Cardinal at Malines or is it the Jesuit in our midst?

The point we wish to make is that no authentic "utterance" of the Cardinal on the matter had been or has so far been made public: yet readers of the *Church Times* might well conclude from the passage we have quoted above, that the Cardinal had "uttered" words capable of being interpreted as approving of the heretical "branch theory" of the Church and of the possibility of being "Catholic" while out of communion with Rome!

We have had to wait, not months, but years before the veil of silence which had been agreed upon has been lifted. At last the Report is in our hands and we eagerly turn to it, hoping to find therein the detailed record of the explanations of the Catholic doctrine on Papal prerogatives which the "Anglo-Catholic" theologians received from Mgr. Batiffol and the other Catholic experts. Alas! after all this labour there appears only a "ridiculus mus." The Catholic contribution to the Report does not contain the Catholic exposition of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy and Infallibility which was given to the Anglicans. It confines itself to "a summary embodying those points of doctrine wherein the Anglicans had agreed with them upon certain common statements." The compilers of the Catholic section of the Report tell us that "they surrendered the opportunity of setting out clearly the ideas and doctrines which they themselves defended and the precise meaning of which they had endeavoured to make clear with all the delicacy of expression that is needed." (p. 73)

In following this course, they were loyally accepting the wish of Cardinal Mercier,

who had dismissed the idea of publishing the actual Minutes of the Conferences. He thought it better that two Reports should be drawn up; that one of them, stating the points on which Catholics and Anglicans were found in agreement, should be made public, while the other, stating the points on which agreement had not been reached, or the discussion of which had been adjourned, should be withheld from publication. (*ib.*)

So far, then, from having a full report we have only the first part, viz., that which Cardinal Mercier thought might be published. Thus, "Malines" still remains partially shrouded in mystery: and it is still possible for enthusiastic and optimistic "Anglo-Catholics" to exercise their imagination in picturing the contrast between the teaching of English and Belgian theologians!

Fortunately, the timely appearance of Pope Pius XI.'s lucid Encyclical on "True Union," which was summarized in *The Times* the day that Lord Halifax's "Notes" were published, leaves no doubt as to the conditions for that communion with the Holy See which alone confers Catholicity, and there are passages in that Encyclical which are so extraordinarily apropos that it will

be hard to show they were not written with reference to Malines as well as to Stockholm and Lausanne.

To return to the "Conversations," and especially to the Catholic Report, which oddly enough is printed as a Supplement. Its author or authors (it is not signed) admit that though the Anglican Church has its formularies and Prayer Book, yet "it is a point of some difficulty to determine what are the doctrinal points common to both sides." They, however, say that there is

undoubted agreement in the doctrine defined by the first Œcumenical Councils. . . In accepting the teaching of the first Œcumenical Councils, Anglicans and Roman Catholics find themselves already in agreement, without needing to go over the matter in detail, upon such primary truths as the mystery of the Holy Trinity . . . on the principal points of traditional Christology . . . and "this agreement extends equally to the Articles of the three Creeds" (p. 77).

One wonders whether, at this point in the Conferences, the "Anglo-Catholics" explained to their Belgian friends how firmly Modernism has taken root in the Established Church and how the recital of the Creeds is no guarantee of belief in their articles. Possibly, if the Catholic theologians had "gone over in detail" Bishop Gore's "Kenotic" theory, they would have seen that even his Christology was heretical. An "Anglo-Catholic," Rev. S. H. Scott, has recently asked in his "Anglo-Catholics and Reunion" (p. 46) "Is it conceivable that the Orthodox Easterns will be satisfied with the explanations of Christological questions as given by Bishop Gore and his school?" Yet Malines was, apparently, more easily satisfied, more ready to presume that the use of the Creeds in the liturgy was a sufficient guarantee of the orthodoxy of Anglicanism on these fundamentals, even though it is notorious that Anglican "comprehensiveness" is wide enough to allow out-and-out Modernists, not merely a share in its Church membership, but the government of its dioceses and the chief control of its Cathedrals.

It is not impossible that when the New Prayer Book is, after its revision, again presented to Parliament, we shall hear portions of the Report read out to help to rally Evangelicals and Nonconformists to another rejection of the Bishops' Book. If so, the information given by the "Anglo-Catholics" regarding the 39 Articles will assuredly be selected for quotation. We give the passage in full as it naively records the impression made on the continental Catholic priests by what they were told.

From explanations given to us [so the Catholic Report runs] it is clear that the 39 Articles of Religion are not the insurmountable obstacle in the way of an understanding be-

tween the two Churches which the Roman¹ Catholics had feared might be the case. In fact, some Anglican theologians believe that those Articles are susceptible of an interpretation which would reconcile them with the teaching of the Council of Trent. Dr. Pusey, for example, was of this opinion, and Dr. Forbes, late Bishop of Brechin. Furthermore, the Anglican clergy in assenting to these Articles are no longer considered bound, as formerly, to accept all and each of the propositions which they contain. In fact, many Anglicans, and more particularly the members of the Episcopal Church of America, consider the Articles as practically obsolete (p. 79).

Agreement was declared to have been reached with regard to the doctrine of the Papacy, to the following extent :—

St. Peter was accepted as chief or "leader" because he was treated as such by our Lord. . . . The Pope possesses a primacy among all the Bishops of Christendom ; . . . from the beginning of Church History there has been recognized to belong to the Bishop of Rome amongst all bishops a primacy and a power of general leadership. Thus the primacy of the Pope is not merely a primacy of honour, but it implies a duty of solicitude and of activity within the universal Church for general good, in such wise that the Pope should, in fact, be a centre of unity, and a Head which exercises authority over the whole (p. 89).

We may imagine with what indignant repudiation the Evangelicals and Modernists would greet even this minimising of the Papal prerogative.

With regard to the disciplinary concessions granted to Uniat Churches and their extension to England should all dogmatic obstacles be removed, the Catholics at Malines very properly declared that "they were not in a position to make any promises which might in future cause grave disappointment" (p. 93).

Again, the "Anglo-Catholics" at Malines gave the impression that :—

Supposing always that all matters relating to doctrine had been already settled, and an agreement had been reached upon a system of discipline, no difficulty would be made by the Anglican bishops about consenting to such an adjustment in regard to Ordination as might seem necessary to the Roman Church in order to place beyond doubt in the eyes of all the validity of their ministry (p. 85).

The Anglican bishops have [it is added] opened a way for a practical solution of a very thorny question, and the Roman Catholics recognize the lofty spirit which has inspired the Anglican Episcopate in this matter, and their readiness to make sacrifices on behalf of reunion (p. 85).

¹ The French authors wrote "Catholiques" throughout: this has been consistently but unwarrantably translated by "Roman Catholics."

On the other hand in the Anglican part of the Report dealing with the regularization of ministries

it was pointed out by the Anglican representatives that the section [of the Lambeth Appeal] in question was inserted to meet the difficulties of non-episcopalians, as its wording shows. Incidentally, it may *doubtless* be applied to the attitude of Anglicans towards Rome (p. 14).

One cannot but question the "doubtless" in this declaration, and we can imagine the indignation of many Bishops when they hear it has been suggested that they would, under any circumstances, submit to reordination by Rome.

Perhaps if the Bishops want to prevent this Report and Lord Halifax's "Notes" from injuring the prospects of the next Revised Prayer Book they would do well to emphasize the declaration that: "Though the conferences have been held with the goodwill of authority, the utterances made at them have been made quite freely on the responsibility of those present, and formally commit no one but themselves" (p. 46). As the Archbishop of Canterbury said in his speech in Convocation on February 6, 1924, which is reprinted in the "Report":—

There have been no negotiations whatever. . . They were private conversations about our respective history and doctrines, and nothing more. . . Were we in this matter to reach at some future time a stage in which the word "negotiations" would be appropriate, I should certainly feel it to be essential that those who would then be going out as in some sense delegates or representatives of the Church of England, should be men who represent the different *points of view* which have a legitimate place in the Church of England (p. 58).

When Evangelicals, Modernists and "Anglo-Catholics" go in one party to Malines, then "Corporate re-union" will be seen by our continental friends to be the utter chimera we, who live at close quarters with Anglicanism, know it to be. "Comprehensiveness"—not Catholicity—is the Anglican ideal, as shown in the Prayer Book debates: but the burning question of to-morrow will be whether Anglican comprehensiveness can be stretched so far as to include men like Lord Halifax and Dr. Kidd.

Unfortunately, the Report—issued as it is in English and French—by its disingenuous ignoring of the true nature of Anglicanism, may serve to perpetuate the deluded optimism of many continental Catholics and permit them still to wonder what delays the "corporate" conversion of England. On the other hand, the Papal Encyclical—"De Vera Religionis Unitate Fovenda"—will do more than a century of "Conversations" on the Malines model to make clear the only conditions under which Anglicans or others can become Catholics.

F. WOODLOCK.

THE BLOW IN THE RITUAL OF CONFIRMATION.

THINGS do not seem to be going very well at present within the bosom of the Church of England and it is natural that nerves should be a little raw, but considering the tone habitually adopted towards Catholicism by such writers as the Dean of St. Paul's and Bishop Barnes, it is hardly reasonable that not a few of our Anglican friends should show themselves so sensitive to the slightest breath of criticism. Thirty years ago the present writer made himself responsible for an annotated translation of the Carthusian Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln. Quite recently Canon R. M. Woolley has published with the S.P.C.K. a history of the same saint for the benefit of his co-religionists.¹ The book seems to us to be rather desultory, and for so short a volume (214 pp.) it is somewhat heavy reading, but the author has taken pains with his subject and although we should occasionally dissent from the opinions expressed we have not come across any notable inaccuracy. In the Preface he refers to the biographies previously in existence, and he is good enough to say that "Father Thurston's Life is much the best of the four;" adding, however, that "it contains a great deal of extraneous matter, and is marred by the propaganda spirit which is evident throughout, and by his unnecessarily anti-Anglican spirit. Canon Perry made mistakes, but was not always in the wrong." We should be curious to know where this "propaganda spirit" and "anti-Anglican spirit" are supposed to manifest themselves, but no further references are given. We are reduced then to consider the only two passages in which any allusion seems to be made to the work in question and we are tempted to say a few words upon each.

By far the more important of the two is that which deals with a feature in the ritual of Confirmation—the *alapa*, or blow given to the candidate by the bishop. The question arises in connection with a story told by Giraldus Cambrensis and repeated in the Metrical Life, concerning an old man who had never been confirmed. He came late for the ceremony, ran after Saint Hugh when he was already riding away to hold the same function in a neighbouring village, demanded that the bishop should turn back for his individual benefit, and when he was bidden to present himself in the place whither the Saint was bound, he sat down on the ground and solemnly called Heaven to witness that the bishop was responsible for his not receiving the Sacrament. To quote the conclusion of the story from Canon Woolley's pages:—

Hugh dropped his reins and considered for a minute or two, then patiently turned back and confirmed him forthwith. When he had confirmed the unreasonable creature, he rebuked

¹ "St. Hugh of Lincoln," by Reginald Maxwell Woolley, Canon of Lincoln. Pp. xii. 214. S.P.C.K., 1927. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

him for having put off the receiving of a Sacrament so necessary for his spiritual well-being until he was on the verge of old age, and gave him a good box on the ears for doing so.

To this Canon Woolley adds a footnote:—

This is the obvious meaning of Giraldus' words¹. . . Father Thurston corrects Canon Perry, who interprets the incident as I have done, in a somewhat superior way, informing him that the *alapa* is the word used in the Pontifical for the slight buffet that is given according to the Latin use in the administration of Confirmation and suggests that Hugh gave a harder tap than usual. But this would be an act of irreverence impossible in Hugh.

Is it really true that Father Thurston "corrects Canon Perry in a somewhat superior way?" The first difficulty arises from the fact that in the book referred to not the slightest allusion is made to Canon Perry in connection with this incident. If anyone is corrected it is Mr. J. F. Dimock, and it would, we submit, be difficult to maintain that Mr. Dimock's editorial labours concerning St. Hugh have been belittled. Let us quote a few sentences.

No one has done so much as Mr. Dimock to make St. Hugh better known to the nation for whose forefathers he came to labour, and it is a pleasure to bear witness that this excellent scholar's criticism is generally accurate, well-informed, and moderate in tone. . . The eloquent and impressive words of this Anglican clergyman will perhaps come home with more force than any eulogy of a Catholic writer who necessarily accepts the Pope's Bull of Canonization as a guarantee of heroic virtue.²

But to this passage a note is appended in the following terms:—

Even Mr. Dimock does not escape all pitfalls. Witness the following footnote, which, it is only fair to say, occurs in the earliest of his contributions to the history of our Saint—the Preface to the Metrical Life. "Some of his jokes were not always in the most accurate episcopal good taste, according to our more refined notions. His slapping the face, for instance, of the aged candidate for Confirmation requires much memory of the then rudeness of manners, before we can at all reconcile our minds to such an antic of a Bishop, and such a Bishop, on such an occasion." Mr. Dimock is evidently unaware that the *alapa* or buffet forms part of the ordinary rite of Confirmation, and is intended to be symbolical of the

¹ "Sed quoniam in senium jam ille vergebat, quia sacramentum hoc salutis necessarium tam diu impetrare distulerat faciei ipsius alapam dextra manu fortiter inflixit." Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. VII., p. 95.

² "Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln" (Quarterly Series), edited by Father Thurston, S.J., Preface, p. xx.

endurance which is expected of a soldier of Christ. It is closely parallel to the blow which, as the Pontificale directs in the "*Benedictio novi militis*," is to be given to the candidate for knighthood.¹

This is absolutely the only reference to the incident which is to be found in the book which Canon Woolley is criticizing. Whether the tone of these comments is objectionably "superior" we must leave it to our readers to decide. The main point is the question of justification. Did this buffet form part of the ritual which St. Hugh was likely to use in confirming those who were presented to him?

Less than a hundred years after the death of St. Hugh, the famous liturgist, William Durandus, Bishop of Mende, who, like Hugh, came from the south-east of France, wrote his well-known "*Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*."² In the 84th chapter of the Sixth Book of that treatise, Durandus deals with the Sacrament of Confirmation and he discusses the matter in considerable detail. In the course of his other comments we read:—

After this the bishop strikes the person confirmed upon the face. The first reason for this is that he may the more tentatively bear in memory the fact that he has received the Sacrament. Secondly, it is done because this Sacrament is conferred for the strengthening of the faith of the baptized Christian—in other words that he may cling so tenaciously to the faith which he has received in baptism as not to blush in future to confess the name of Christ before anyone whatsoever. . . Thirdly, this blow stands for an imposition of hands, since the Apostles confirmed by the imposition of hands (alone). Fourthly, this is done to scare away the spirit of evil, that the devil may flee and not return. For it was in this wise that the Blessed Benedict acted, setting free by a buffet the monk who was tormented by an evil spirit, as we may read in St. Gregory's "*Dialogues*." There are two things, then, which the bishop does—first he anoints him on the forehead and secondly he strikes him in the face. The unction is typical of that lubrication of grace which nerves the soul for deeds of daring in all that concerns the faith. But the blow is given that he may not be shamefaced or fear to confess the name of Christ. It is as if the Bishop said to the person confirmed: "Be thou so strong that, whoever it may be who smites thee like this or puts shame upon thee because thou professest the name of Christ, an angry colour may never mount to thy cheeks," since those that are smitten on the face are wont to flush in consequence. In some places newly-

¹ "*Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln*," p. xx., note.

² The book seems to have been compiled in 1286. Durandus died in 1296.

made knights are subjected to the same treatment and for the same reason.

Surely this speaks for itself. If the blow was really meant to be remembered, in much the same way as the boundaries of the parish in days of old were impressed upon the memories of the younger generation by taking them there and flogging them soundly, Durandus could not have been contemplating a mere tap on the cheek. One would infer that in the case of children, at any rate, the buffet in Confirmation was wont to be inflicted with vigour. Probably, however, a bishop confirming an adult, and more particularly an old man, would usually strike a very gentle blow, and for that reason in the case before us it is recorded that St. Hugh by exception *faciei ipsius alapam dextra manu fortiter inflixit* administered the buffet with the full force of his right hand.

All those who are familiar with liturgical texts of early date know that directive rubrics are of extremely rare occurrence. This is probably the reason why in the mediæval pontificals we find as a rule no explicit mention of the *alapa*. But what we do find as early as the ninth century (see e.g., Migne, Vol. 138, c. 958, in a text borrowed from Gerbert) is the ejaculation, "Pax tibi" or "Pax tecum" which now accompanies the *alapa*. It seems quite reasonable to suppose that the buffet was administered even then.

The other point of criticism to which reference was made above is Canon Woolley's somewhat crude statement that "the picture of St. Hugh given in Fr. Thurston's book is certainly not St. Hugh of Lincoln." We reply that there was never any idea of suggesting that this 15th century painting by Lodovico da Parma was an authentic likeness of St. Hugh; but, for the reasons given in the Life (p. 624), this monastic figure in Carthusian dress with crozier and aureole inscribed "S. Ugo" can hardly have been intended to represent any other saint. We may confess that we are utterly sceptical as to the attribution of what Canon Woolley calls the "portrait statue" on the west front of Lincoln Cathedral. This is a bearded figure, and St. Hugh, who was in an extraordinary degree punctilious in matters of ecclesiastical propriety, and who with his own hand is recorded to have shorn off the locks of clerics who let their hair grow long, is not in the least likely to have set an example in defiance of the canons which forbade ecclesiastics to wear beards (*nutrire barbam*).¹

H.T.

¹ See further the article "Beard," by the present writer, in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," Vol. II., pp. 362-363; and, on the blow, the article "Confirmation (Roman Catholic)" in Hastings, "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics," Vol. IV., p. 10.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**American
Naval
Plans.**

We are only now realizing the disastrous effects on international peace prospects of the failure of the Geneva Conference on Naval Disarmament. It was prophesied at the time that these would be the result of non-success for, if three peace-loving nations, whose margin of naval strength over the rest of the world was so gigantic, could not in their mutual interest shake off some of their enormous burden, how slight would be the hope of agreement amongst a larger number. Here was the problem of disarmament reduced to its simplest dimensions: all parties possessed goodwill and freedom of action, yet the chances of agreement were wrecked by mistaken tactics. The first and worst mistake would seem to have been the cut and dried programme of minimum requirements which Great Britain presented. Yet it sounds reasonable enough to say: "I cannot go below that but I'll go down to that," until one reflects that defensive needs bear an essential relation to potential dangers, and that the peace-makers' business is as much to remove dangers as to guard against them. We cannot get away from the fact that America proposed at Geneva a total cruiser tonnage which was about half that proposed by Great Britain. However, we need not debate the details here: it is enough to note that the British attitude, modified too late by the postponement of two-thirds of her naval programme, has suggested a similar course to the States. There, the Secretary of the Navy has proposed and got passed by the Naval Affairs Committee for presentation to Congress a colossal Naval Construction scheme, based, like Great Britain's, on what is considered the country's needs. Moreover, the scheme is to be withdrawn from the President's discretion, so that he cannot modify or protract it in accord with the world situation. No one, as we have often said, can question America's right to build all the ships she pleases: no foreign critic can know all the motives that stir President Coolidge, a man of peace and economy, to this enormous expenditure: as a riposte to the British proposals at Geneva it is magnificent, but the most patriotic American must grant that it is not a good example to a world crushed by the weight of armaments and anxious for relief. America disclaims any purpose of competitive building; but in effect that is the inevitable alternative to mutually agreed reduction.

**Navies
and
Trade.**

That the States are merely following Great Britain's example is stated in so many words by the Naval Secretary in detailing his programme. After contrasting the 300,000 tons of cruiser-tonnage proposed by America with the British 600,000 tons minimum, Mr. Wilbur continued:—

We were, however, willing to accept the hazard of building

less tonnage than we needed, if other Powers would accept similar hazards. Great Britain was not ready to accept this limitation, but felt that a larger tonnage in cruisers was imperative for the protection of her national interests. The insistence of Great Britain's naval experts and delegates at Geneva upon her absolute need for a larger tonnage in cruisers, regardless of the naval programmes of other Powers, is the most persuasive evidence that we also have a definite need for a certain cruiser tonnage, regardless of the programmes of other Powers, if we are to have a well-rounded fleet for our defence, and also that such a programme for us is in no sense competitive. A programme of twenty-five cruisers, five aircraft-carriers, nine destroyer leaders, and thirty-two submarines was in no way competitive, but was based upon the needs of the U.S. Navy, as determined by technical advice.

He then went on to disclose, what otherwise would be unintelligible, that this immense naval force was called for by the demands of American commerce. It is this plea which, put forth by every industrial nation, forms the main obstacle to peace. Not only is war-preparation an industry in itself—Mr. Wilbur says that ship-building must be maintained, and so, no doubt, say the steel-trusts which are interested—but also the navy promotes overseas trade. "Showing the flag had a marked influence upon our merchants' endeavours, and their success is influenced in no small degree by the prestige which up-to-date and smart modern cruisers create and foster."

We have always said that the union of Mars and Mammon makes working for peace the hardest task on earth. Yet little is done to dissolve this union: the League of Nations seems afraid to touch it: private manufacture of armaments is still imperfectly controlled: and armed forces, especially ships of war, are maintained as tokens of a nation's powers of aggression.

**The Outlawry
of
War.**

On the other hand while the Naval Secretary is calling for 150 million pounds worth of ships and guns, the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, is outbidding M. Briand in proposals for the outlawry of war. It is six or seven months since the latter suggested that France and America should make a Pact of Perpetual Friendship, declaring that the two peoples "condemn recourse to war, renounce it as an instrument of their national policy towards each other, and agree that a settlement of disputes arising between them, of whatever nature or origin they may be, shall never be sought by either party except through pacific means." Manifestly, this complete renunciation of war would be a splendid example to the world, but difficulties might arise concerning the attitude of

either party towards the enemies of either party. So Mr. Kellogg, in answer to M. Briand's proposals, which was meant to be a model for all other nations, suggested, naturally enough, that those other nations should be invited at once to follow that model. Let France join with the American Government "in an effort to obtain the adherence of all the principal Powers of the world, renouncing war as an instrument of national policy." It will be seen that this proposal is almost identical with the resolution outlawing aggressive warfare passed by the September Assembly of the League. As France and America are already bound by the Bryan Arbitration Treaty, which it is proposed to strengthen and renew, (it lapses on February 27th) more must be meant by this additional suggestion than the rejection of war embodied in that Treaty. We cannot too constantly remind ourselves that the threat of war as an instrument of policy has been given up already by the signatories of the League Covenant, and still more categorically set aside by the parties to the Locarno Treaties—always saving the right of legitimate defence, provided the attacked party was willing to submit the issue to final arbitration. There is nothing, therefore, out of the way in suggesting the making of a multilateral pact of the sort, made to harmonize with the League obligations, and it would have the enormous advantage of convincing the United States that Europe is not really contemplating another war, and of making more superfluous than ever the maintenance of mighty armaments, especially on the seas.

**Need of further
Discussion.**

The pessimists and the cynics are, of course, laughing at these projects, seeing nothing on the American side but the manœuvring of domestic politics, and pointing to Nicaragua and the Naval Appropriations to support their mistrust. It is true that the outlawry of war means or presupposes the outlawry of imperialism, of commercial covetousness, of racial arrogance, of historic enmities—we were going to say, of original sin. But these evil tendencies can be controlled, if not eradicated, and the formal repudiation of war as a means of gratifying them cannot but help in controlling them. It would become a factor in forming that imponderable but enormously strong influence in human affairs—public opinion. If the young, whose historical education brings them so constantly into contact with warfare of every description, could be taught that Christian civilization now regarded anything but defensive war as unChristian and uncivilized, a generation might grow up immune to the infection diffused by the militarist, the pseudo-patriot and the war-trader. The world-pact against war is still a subject of "conversations" between France and America, and, no doubt, the other Great Powers to whom the suggestion has been formally made are contributing their views. We

trust that good-will and honesty of purpose will bring about a fruitful result. Nothing, as we have before hinted, can do more to secure that than an agreement between this country and America concerning the freedom of the seas in time of war. As the prospect of war becomes more and more remote, the possibility of such agreement should approach nearer.

**Latin America
and
the U.S.A.**

It is too early to discuss the bearing on the peace of the world which the proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of American States may have. It was opened at Havana on January 16th by President Coolidge himself at the head of an imposing delegation, and it will sit for six weeks. The attitude of the United States towards those parts of the western hemisphere which lie south of them forms a fascinating theme for the student of political institutions. At present, the States are immensely superior in population, material wealth and material civilization to all the other Republics taken together, and owing to commercial penetration they virtually are, and by virtue of the Monroe Doctrine act as, the suzerain of the rest. Even if the other seventeen Republics could effectively co-operate, pool their resources and act as a unit, they could not ultimately resist the will of the States expressed in armed force. In the circumstances the States are always subject to the temptation of becoming imperialistic, and the wealthy financiers that flourish there do nothing to lessen that temptation. The central American republics, small in territory and population but full of natural wealth, are already largely in the commercial grip of their big neighbour. Further south, there is more independence, and there is no reason why in course of time Brazil and its neighbours should not rival in resources the colossus in the North. Latin America is quite alive to its condition of tutelage and, no doubt, during the Conference its resentment will be freely expressed, and perhaps the Monroe Doctrine, grown portentously since the days of its eponym, will in some of its developments be sharply questioned. Nothing could have been nicer than President Coolidge's opening speech with its full recognition of State sovereignty in all the members of the Pan-American Union, of identity of political interest, of mutual pursuit of peace. But in both hemispheres there will be many keen and critical observers, and the prestige of the U.S.A. as vindicator of human freedom and upholder of democratic ideals will depend on the result of their scrutiny. It is with particular interest that Catholics in this country, and indeed in Europe generally, will follow the discussion, by the recently-founded American Catholic Association for International Peace, of "Pan-American Relations," which is the first item on their agenda for their Spring convention. We

should be especially glad to read a calm and reasoned exposition of the Monroe doctrine from the standpoint of Catholic international ethics.

Industrial Peace.

In 1926—the year of the General Strike and the prolonged Coal Stoppage—3,324,400 working days were lost during its first seven months.

Last year the days lost during the same period, later statistics being unavailable, numbered only 787,000. Hence we are safe in concluding that last year we had comparative peace in industry. Unhappily, it was a peace of exhaustion and connoted no rise in prosperity. The coal industry has steadily declined, owing apparently to a progressive decline in world consumption, and, in default of some means of turning coal cheaply into other forms of energy, the end is not yet in sight. Wages on the whole have also declined, and, of course, low wages mean a lowering of the pulse of welfare. This sad result has convinced the responsible leaders of labour that the strike, as hitherto employed, is a futile, foolish and suicidal weapon, and so in September of last year the Trades Union Congress at Edinburgh officially discarded it in favour of arbitration: thus incidentally turning much of the Trades Disputes Act, now fully operative, into waste paper. The T.U. General Council was authorized to pursue "a policy of co-operation in an endeavour to work out a practical solution of industrial troubles by methods of conciliation." This decision will do much to reassure the public that, in spite of foolish sayings and doings, the break between organized Labour and Communism, whether native or foreign, is complete and, we trust, final. It is tacitly admitted that the reconstruction of industry can be accomplished within the limits of the capitalist system, however much that may have to be modified. The class-war ideal has been abandoned in favour of conciliation and co-operation.

The Industrial Conference inaugurated.

A speedy recognition, on the part of "Capital," of this change of heart and policy followed. Under the general inspiration of Sir Alfred Mond a group of the leading employers, representing, it is said, about £1,000,000,000 of capital and some 160 public limited liability companies, invited, on November 23rd, the T.U. General Council to discuss with them the industrial situation, saying, *inter alia*: "We believe that the common interests which bind us are more powerful than the apparently divergent interests which seem to separate," and proposing, therefore, "direct negotiation with the twin objects of the restoration of industrial prosperity and the corresponding improvement of the standard of living of the population." This may be considered, speaking broadly, as a change of

heart on the Capitalist side; a fuller appreciation, at any rate, that the welfare of the worker is really necessary for the welfare of the industry. It is something to have a large employer like Sir A. Mond acknowledging that "the real cure for unrest and depression is not lower wages and longer hours, but increased efficiency and output, lower costs, higher wages." On December 20th the T.U. Council accepted "without prejudice" the employers' invitation, and the joint conference started its investigations in London on January 12th. It is too early to speak of its probable fortunes. Sir A. Mond has not carried all captains of industry with him: the Labour extremists headed by Mr. Cook are against all truck with Capital. But in circumstances and personnel, it has better prospects than favoured previous attempts. There was a National Industrial Conference convened by Government in 1919, before war-prosperity, or indeed the war-spirit, had evaporated. The present Conference is economic not political, spontaneous, not Governmental: and it is of a preliminary character, allowing the full freedom of discussion which delegates cannot so well claim. Two sub-committees have been appointed to settle the agenda and, meanwhile, under the auspices of the Industrial Christian Fellowship, appeals for industrial co-operation are being widely signed both by employers and workers.

**The Pope's
Encyclical
on Religious Unity.**

It is with peculiar thankfulness that British Catholics welcome the Holy Father's last Encyclical—"De Vera Religionis Unitate Fovenda"—for it endorses with the highest magisterial authority all that they have long been contending for, regarding the mischievous illusion of a possible "Corporate Reunion" between the Catholic Church and the Anglican establishment. Not that they needed the Pope's clear declarations about the nature of the Church and about the conditions requisite for belonging to the fold, but they found the issues clouded in the minds of their separated brethren by the well-meant, but in the event unfortunate, attempts made by various Catholics abroad to ease the Anglican approach to Rome by keeping in the background what was involved in becoming a Catholic. By fostering the idea that the Anglicans formed a Church in the Catholic sense they made it more difficult for those earnest seekers after truth to understand the essential qualities of the Church of Christ—visible unity, unicity, indefectibility, and the rest—and to get rid of the fallacy of "Continuity," the greatest obstacle in their minds to the perception of truth. And they damaged the force of our apologetic here at home by the implication that there were two views of certain Church doctrines, especially of the Papal primacy—the rigid and the more reasonable.

¹ Published by Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne for ad.

It was in vain that the Catholic press here pointed out these inconveniences: it was rebuked for its "brutality" and scorned for its presumed ignorance. Misled by their charitable zeal many of our foreign brethren—we are not referring to the assessors at Malines whose presentment of the Catholic case has not been published—ran a grave risk of compromising the truth. Now, all that subterfuge and minimizing is done with. Like the blast of a trumpet the Papal declaration of the true conditions of unity must penetrate the most carefully-shielded ears. The unchangeable claims of Christ's Church are stated fully and uncompromisingly for the intellectual acceptance of the would-be Catholic. Many, no doubt, will find the saying hard, but many, let us hope, will realize that so, and only so, should the Church of Christ speak, not with an uncertain or ambiguous utterance, but like her Master Himself "with authority." Our view of the direct effect of the Malines "Conversations" is stated elsewhere: they are almost wholly nugatory and negative. What, for instance, is the use of proclaiming joint acceptance of the Creeds, if the motive of acceptance is entirely different? Only the Catholic accepts the Creeds on the infallible authority of the Church. Already, the *Church Times* (January 20th) is at work interpreting the inadequate Catholic statement as implying some sort of change in the dogmatic attitude of the Church. Anyhow, the new Encyclical must surely discourage any further experiment of the sort.

**"Very Striking
Unanimity."**

The *Church Times* comment on the Malines Report, just alluded to, has confirmed the opinion we have always expressed about the unlikelihood of any good resulting from the "Conversations" to compensate for the slur cast thereby upon English Catholic knowledge, courtesy and zeal. The *Church Times* says that the members reached "an important measure of agreement on a number of essential points," but its own discussion of them only accentuates the differences. It owns that, "in the Church of England, there exists a wide range of dogmatic differences which has no counterpart in the Church of Rome," and that, therefore, those who met at Malines "represented those angles of the two Communions where contact is nearest." But, as was just implied, there are no "angles" in the Roman communion: Catholic doctrine is a clear, consistent, rounded, whole. As the recent Encyclical says, the Church recognizes no distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas, since faith has only one basis, the authority of God revealing. Hence the Belgian Catholic is no nearer to, or further from, the "Anglo-Catholic" section of Anglicanism than is the British Catholic. There is a bottomless gulf between the two bodies which can be crossed only by the Catholic becoming an apostate or by the Angli-

can joining the true Church, the Church of Rome. In effect, as we have implied, the *Church Times* writer, in spite of his parading points of argument, recognizes this. He owns that between the doctrine of the Papal Primacy claimed by Catholics, and the Primacy of Honour and Responsibility, which is the utmost his school will allow—and how many would repudiate even that!—there is “an apparently deep and even fundamental difference.” And he goes on to say that “the whole trend, both of orthodoxy and of Anglicanism, is against” the Visible Headship of the Pope. “The world is losing faith in centralized machinery.” Note the appeal of this Christian to the world as a model for the Church. It is true that the various branches of Anglicanism in the Dominions have become autonomous: it is true that Orthodoxy is divided into independent racial bodies: both so proving, as we hold, that they have no part in Catholicism, which, being the mystical Body of Christ, demands a single Head. Regarding the other *rapprochements*, it is much the same. The writer contends that the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, as explained at Malines, would have prevented “endless misunderstandings,” if it had been so expounded “at the beginning of the sixteenth century.” But there has been no change in the Catholic explanation of that doctrine, and the English Reformers, many of them apostate priests, knew exactly what the doctrine was. When we add that the writer, whilst mentioning as a matter of agreement that “the Bible needs the interpretation of the Church before it is capable of being received as the ultimate standard of faith,” goes on to claim the fullest liberty for Biblical criticism and to denounce Rome’s narrowness in the matter, we may better judge what he means by the “striking unanimity” he discovers in the Report.

Finally, the writer entirely rejects, in the teaching Church of his conception, the attribute of infallibility. “Infallibility, to the modern Christian outlook, apart from the Papal obedience [an important and significant exception] wears increasingly the appearance of an unnecessary incumbrance.” Accordingly, his Church may say to the Christian, “Believe this on pain of damnation,” but must in honesty add, “Of course, I may be wrong.” If this is as far as “Malines” has brought the “Anglo-Catholics,” it seems hardly worth all the trouble taken.

The Anglican “League of Religions.” We had thought that the Editor of the *Green Quarterly* was alone, or almost alone, in his contention that the “comprehensiveness” of the Church of England, which on “Anglo-Catholic” principles should be considered a grave defect, is in reality a “priceless asset.” He actually finds support in another advanced “Anglo-Catholic,” the Rev. Wilfred Knox, who writes in a volume on the late Deposited Prayer Book, speaking of the

Church of England :—" Her comprehensiveness is her glory, so long as the whole body of Christian thought has come to no final adjustment of the rival claims of Catholicism, Protestantism and Liberalism." And the *Church Times* itself (January 13th) invoking the great principle of "inclusiveness," asserts that two *conflicting* theories of consecration have equal rights within the Church of England. "Both are recognized schools of thought." If the assessors at Malines had facts like these put before them, they might have been more chary about prolonging the discussions. If the good Monks of Unity at Amay would only keep them carefully in mind they will better understand how to deal with Anglicanism in future.

The Passing
of
Thomas Hardy.

No Catholic can leave moral considerations out of count when forming his estimate of those whom the world calls great. "All men are vain (*i.e.*, empty of real good) in whom there is not the knowledge of God," we are assured by the Book of Wisdom, and that is especially true of those who use their talents, consciously or not, to spread their agnosticism. No one can doubt the literary genius of the late Thomas Hardy: unfortunately his practical atheism was no less indubitable—a fact, of which those who gave his ashes burial, against it would seem his own wishes, in what passes for a Christian temple cannot have been ignorant. We are not of those who think that literary excellence can atone for the harmful matter which it clothes: rather the reverse is the case: the poison is the more dangerous because made palatable and alluring. The conscience of the great poet-novelist is beyond our judgment: we can only appraise his work, which was often made the vehicle of a sour railing against God's gracious Providence and a contempt for Christian ideals. Worse, because more irrational, than the total denial of God's existence, is belief in an evil God, whom one is bound to defy and thwart, and that belief pervades much of Hardy's work. A Catholic author, himself a poet and *litterateur*, Lionel Johnson, long ago praised what was praiseworthy in his book, "The Art of Thomas Hardy"; but nothing which that art could achieve in faithful reproduction of natural beauty makes up for Hardy's moral blindness to the supernatural beauty of a world, fallen yet redeemed.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Asceticism, Defence of Catholic [A. O'Rahilly in *Month*, Feb. 1928, p. 123].

Revelation changeless because true [W. J. Blyton in *Catholic Gazette*, Jan. 1928, p. 4].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Barnes, Bishop, advocate of Birth Control and rationalism [H.R. in *Catholic Times*, Jan. 6, 1928, p. 23].

Birth Control anti-social [P. L. Blakely, S.J., in *America*, Dec. 17, 1927, p. 239].

Catholic Supranationalism contrasted with Fascism and Bolshevism [M. Vaussard in *Revue Apologétique*, Jan. 1928, p. 5].

Duelling in German Universities: attitude of Church and State towards [Documentation Catholique, Dec. 17, 1927, p. 1170 etc.].

Meletios of Alexandria, his hatred of Catholicism [Tablet, Dec. 31, 1927, p. 885].

Mexican Outrages condoned by U.S. Government [Catholic Times, Dec. 30, 1927, p. 8].

Pre-Reformation England never in schism [C.A.S. in Tablet, Dec. 31, 1927, p. 886; Jan. 7, 1928, p. 7].

Prayer Book Crisis proves Anglicanism a creation of the State [J. Keating, S.J., in Month, Feb. 1928, p. 97].

Protestantism essentially disruptive [J. B. Reeves, O.P., in Blackfriars, Jan. 1928, p. 13].

Reunion fallacies finally dissipated by Rome [Tablet, Jan. 14, 1928, p. 37; Papal Encyclical, *ibid.* Jan. 21].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Catholic Directory, Difficulties of compiling an accurate [T. F. Meehan in *Catholic World*, Jan. 1928, p. 461].

Christianity seen by Pagans—Pliny and Trajan [A. L. Maycock in *Catholic World*, Jan. 1928, p. 440].

Evolution, The Bee a disproof of Materialistic [Rt. Rev. A. MacDonald in *Thought*, Dec. 1927, p. 464].

Life, The Origin of [L. Vialleton in *Revue Apologétique*, Jan. 1928, p. 30].

Malthusians needlessly frightened by prospect of over-population [Dossiers de l'Action Populaire, Jan. 10, 1928, p. 13].

Peace, How to secure International [Dossiers de l'Action Populaire, Jan. 10, 1928, p. 1].

Portugal, Religious Conditions in [M. P. Cleary in *Studies*, Dec. 1927, p. 616].

President of U.S.A., Not expedient to have a Catholic [Fortnightly Review (St. Louis), Jan. 1, 1928, p. 3].

Press, Exclusion of Corrupt, from Ireland [Fr. R. S. Devane and others in *Studies*, Dec. 1927, p. 545].

Roman Question, The [Y. de la Brière in *Etudes*, Jan. 5, 1928, p. 94].

Social Ethics, Need of preaching [C. Bruehl, D.D., in *Homiletic Review*, Jan. 1928, p. 349].

REVIEWS

I—TWO BOOKS ON MYSTICISM¹

WAS it not time to do something towards giving its proper place to English mysticism in the History of Catholic spirituality? Père Pourrat, who devotes to German mystics a long chapter of 45 pages in his *History of Christian Spirituality in the Middle Ages* (Eng. Trans.), allows but eight lines in the text to the mystics of this country. Yet surely we have treatises which are true classics,—the “Cloud of Unknowing,” the “Scale of Perfection,” “A Mirror for Simple Souls,” to say nothing of “Sancta Sophia,” and still later writings. Father Faber, for instance, though not “ex-professo” a writer on mysticism proper, has left valuable contributions to mystical literature in certain passages of his works, very specially in the “Creator and Creature.” Could we not have an attempt at dealing with English spirituality analogous to what the outstanding treatise of Père Bremond has done for the history of French Catholic thought?

The first of the volumes before us, by Dom Knowles of Downside Abbey, points the way. It is not an exhaustive treatise, and as it is written apparently for the ordinary reader who may be unacquainted with the principles of mystical science, some of the space is taken up with an Introduction giving information which might properly be assumed in an historical work. There is also a short treatise, in the form of an Appendix, regarding contemporary Protestant thought on the subject, which though interesting in itself, is hardly necessary in a description of English Catholic mystics.

But we extend a hearty welcome to a scholarly work which may well be called a “Happy Inspiration.” May it be widely known and read, and may the path which is blazed in its pages be followed in the near future by other and perhaps fuller treatises on the subject. That the book should have emanated from one of Abbot Butler’s disciples raises the hope that either Dom Knowles himself or one of his brethren will dig yet deeper into a soil which has proved itself to be so rich in fertility.

Readers already acquainted with the works of Evelyn Underhill will find her latest book, *Man and the Supernatural*, not the

¹ (1) *The English Mystics*. By Dom David Knowles, O.S.B. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. ix. 210. Price, 6s. 1927.

(2) *Man and the Supernatural*. By Evelyn Underhill. London: Methuen and Co. Pp. x. 275. Price, 7s. 6d. n. 1927.

least brilliant and profound of her writings. In fact, it bespeaks development both in style and in mentality. She writes herself of "describing something which has gradually loomed up and become ever clearer to me but has not yet finished coming clear." What she is rapidly grasping more clearly (not but what she always showed some intuition of it) is the superiority of Christian over non-Christian mysticism. On almost every page of her recent writing she strengthens her assertions by quotations from Catholic authorities; Aquinas and Augustine, Von Hügel and à Kempis, St. Ignatius and Gerard Hopkins, Grou and Hilton, Cardinal Mercier and Lucie-Christine—and again Augustine and Augustine again. This by no means to the exclusion of other and non-Catholic authorities; but it requires little "reading between the lines" to detect where now lies the true orientation of this interesting author's soul and mind.

What, however, Miss Underhill has not yet grasped is the real basis of the difference between Catholic and non-Catholic mysticism. The difference is ultimate, not necessarily seen on the surface. Ultimately, the Catholic mystic relies upon Divine Faith, and that depends upon some external and objective authority quite different in kind (and not merely in degree) from a supposed collection of "particular" witnesses, or what the writer elsewhere calls the "certitude of the saints." No doubt Miss Underhill writes as a believer in Institutionalism (to use a horrid word), but she utterly fails to grasp its significance as affecting the very authorities upon whom she relies to fortify her assertions. As to her use of the term "Supernatural," unfortunately it must be appalling to a Catholic. She evidently guessed that it would be so. She uses the term to express all that is opposed to Naturalism, or the degrading outlook of the sensual mind upon life. Not that "Nature" as understood by the Modern writers is regarded as necessarily degraded; but they view it as being in antagonism to the spiritual, the transcendent, the real—or "the way of seeing the world which shall justify the Saint, the Artist and the Scientist."

Such a view of Nature can only be regarded with horror by the Catholic mind, and it is a view which makes any mind imbued with it deeply incapable of even dimly realizing what we mean by "supernature," or more properly "the Supernatural."

In the work reviewed above Dom Knowles rejoices that Miss Underhill is giving to the English-speaking world an opportunity through her writings of learning to know and love a good deal more than they have done previously, many of our Saints and Mystics. While approving this note of gratitude we also think it our duty to warn English readers, both Catholics and others, that they are not free to regard this highly-gifted historian of our Mystics as a true interpreter of their supernatural life.

2—CHRISTIAN ORIGINS¹

OF late years the traditional account of Christian Origins has been subjected to a storm of criticism. Where this has to do with the Apostolic age the intention has been to destroy the idea of the Church as a divine institution. The only answer is to recommend a sound knowledge of the history of those times. The book under notice provides a clear and readable account of that history and brings out the fact that the traditional account of Church origins has solid documentary evidence to back it. It should be notably useful to those who have to teach the history of this period.

While the author is generally careful to distinguish between well established fact and unsupported tradition, occasionally he goes beyond his evidence. For instance, Denis the Areopagite is quoted as a reliable witness for events of Our Lady's life and death, whereas the works formerly ascribed to him are now acknowledged to be the work of an unknown writer not earlier than the fourth and perhaps as late as the sixth century.

The proofs given of certain cardinal points of doctrine—such as the Primacy of Peter, the necessity of Tradition as a source of dogma, and the origin of the Church's hierarchy—are also of apologetic value. As regards the hierarchy, however, it is improbable that any indication of the monarchical Episcopate, in which resides the Apostolic succession, can be fairly traced in the Acts or in the Epistles of St. Paul. It seems much more probable from the silence of these sources that at that time the Apostles reserved to themselves those functions which were only towards the end of the Apostolic age committed to the Bishops of the sees. Timothy and Titus appear to be Apostolic Delegates rather than local Bishops.

 3—A NEW BOOK ON THE SCHOOLS OF EARLY CHRISTIAN IRELAND²

IT is impossible to read this fascinating little volume without a feeling of deep sympathy for its kindly and cultured author. Mr. Hanson was married to an Irish wife, who was called recently to a premature reward. As a tribute to her memory he has chosen to expound for English readers a glorious but forgotten chapter in the history of her country.

¹ *The Primitive Church, or, The Church in the Days of the Apostles.* By Rev. D. I. Lanslots, O.S.B., with a preface by the Rt. Rev. F.C. Kelley, D.D., Bishop of Oklahoma. London: Herder. Pp. x. 295. Price, 9s. n.

² *The Early Monastic Schools of Ireland.* By W. G. Hanson. Cambridge: Heffer. Pp. xi. 135. Price, 3s. 6d. n.

The four sections into which the book is divided deal successively with the monastic schools at home in Ireland, the work of Columbanus and his missionary companions on the Continent, the writings of Irish scholars in the eighth and ninth centuries, and the philosophic greatness of Scotus Eriugena.

As to the monastic schools, Mr. Hanson believes that they grew in a natural way, once the educated classes, who had a tradition of learning coming down from early Celtic times, were won to the Christian faith. Zimmer is not referred to by name, but his theory (adopted by Kuno Meyer) that the origin of the schools was due to an influx of Christian rhetoricians from Gaul, is thus implicitly rejected. Mr. Hanson describes with wealth of illustration how in the sixth century "the whole of Ireland was practically turned into a University," whilst thereafter "long lines of learned men added fame to Ireland and drew to her schools students from far and wide; and through their labours the spirit of Ireland found expression in a code of law which shewed a fine sense of justice, in a literary language rich and musical, and in a system of metrical prosody shaped with the utmost skill." In his treatment of St. Colmcille he relies too much on the works of Dr. Douglas Simpson, whose theories should be received with caution.

A good account is given of the work of St. Columbanus and companions in Gaul and Italy, but it is certainly surprising that a well-informed writer like Mr. Hanson should harbour a lingering doubt as to their orthodoxy. In one place he actually states that "on several points of religious doctrine they professed opinions absolutely opposed to those of the Roman Catholics." Can it be that Mr. Hanson regards the form of tonsure and the chronological dispute about Easter as points of "religious doctrine"? And if not, why should he allow himself to be betrayed into so extravagant an assertion?

That Irish scholars of the ninth century were dominated by Alexandrian Hellenism, "with its learned subtlety, its wrangling and rash dialectic and its enthusiasm for liberty," we can hardly be expected to admit without proof. To deduce from Eriugena, a man of character so individualistic that it may well be called unique, "what were the opinions of the Irish philosophers of the ninth century" is surely illogical. Eriugena's system is excellently summarized from Professor Bett's most interesting monograph, but we hope that Mr. Hanson does not agree with the Professor's bold assertion that "if there is to be complete Christian philosophy at all it must be monistic." The abandonment of Christian dualism, with ultimate unity through creation, would, we think, harmonize but ill with the High-Church sentiments which find repeated expression in Mr. Hanson's work.

J.R.

4—SAINTHOOD¹

IT would be hard to do justice to the untiring activity of the little band of Jesuit scholars who carry on the hagiographical researches, first organized, now nearly three centuries ago, by Father John Bollandus. Although the great work of the *Acta Sanctorum*, which has reached the middle of November, still remains in some sense the most important of their literary undertakings, the subsidiary labours necessitated by modern scholarship have led to great developments in other directions. Not only do the present Bollandist Fathers maintain a periodical of their own, the "*Analecta Bollandiana*," and contribute papers to congresses and the proceedings of learned societies, but they have also made themselves responsible for a series of monographs, which now total seventeen separate volumes under the general title of "*Subsidia Hagiographica*." The book before us is one of them and its general aim is very well described by its sub-title. It is "an essay on the cultus of the saints in the distant past." Those who may have had the good fortune to be present at Père Delehaye's series of three lectures delivered at King's College, London in October, 1926, will recognize that he set before his audience on that occasion the pith of the dissertation which appears in a more expanded form in the volume just published. The book deals with the origin of the term "Saint," noting first the specialized signification of "Martyr" and demolishing by the way a rather ridiculous theory of which Dr. Geffcken has made himself the exponent, and then turning to explain the gradual process by which a second class of Saints, the "Confessors," came eventually to be recognized. Naturally this leads him on to consider the practices and in some measure the ritual by which this early veneration of the saintly departed made itself manifest, and with the same investigation is closely connected the form of sanction accorded by local Churches to the keen desire which was everywhere felt to do honour to the champions of the Faith. Hence we have a concise but pregnant account of martyrologies, liturgical "lessons" and the cultus of relics. But not the least interesting feature of the volume are the two concluding chapters—the one devoted to "Saints who have never existed," and the other to the general question of the meaning of "Sanctity." No one who is at all in touch with this department of scholarship will be ignorant that in all these matters Père Delehaye speaks as a master. Even apart from the clear and often brilliantly illuminating outline of the whole development, the bibliographical references given in the footnotes would alone make this a work of great value to the student. We may add that by the purchase of this and other Bollandist publications Catholics

¹ *Sanctus, Essai sur le Culte des Saints dans l'Antiquité*, par Hippolyte Delehaye, Bollandiste, Bruxelles, Société des Bollandistes, 1927. Pp. viii, 266.

may lend substantial help towards the maintenance of a scholarly institution which forms at the present day one of the most reliable bulwarks we possess against the onset of a purely agnostic school of historical criticism.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

WE merely notice the publication of Père A. d'Alès's important book — *Providence et Libre Arbitre* (Beauchesne: 14.00 fr.). It would take more than one article in *THE MONTH* to deal adequately with this contribution to a secular controversy. How can an almighty Providence, working irresistibly to its predestined end, be reconciled with the fact of man's free will? Here is one of those matters *quæ exeunt in mysterium*. One welcome fact emerges from this discussion between Père d'Alès and his learned Dominican adversary: the theologians of both camps have learnt to approach their task of study and criticism in a less polemical temper, seeking the truth and following the argument whithersoever it leads, with utter indifference to the triumph of school and party. "Il ne nous coûte nullement," says Père d'Alès, "d'avouer qu', au cours de cette discussion, nous avons plus d'une fois senti le poids des raisons adverses." In such a spirit alone can this great argument be profitably pursued.

BIBLICAL.

The Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas upon St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans has been translated into German for the first time by Father Helmut Fahsel and published as *Des heiligen Thomas von Aquin Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Herder: 12 marks). The book is very well brought out, and for the most part the translation is good and clear, the whole work being worthy of its great original. A dogmatic epistle such as that to the Romans shows St. Thomas' scholastic powers at their best, though in matters philological and some other respects he is subject to the limitations of his time. We are sorry that the translator has not put in some more work of his own, by way of general introduction and explanation and illustration. Certainly it would have been better to add some footnotes than to slip into the translation amplifications which have nothing corresponding to them in the original, as on p. 76: "die nämlich mit dem Unglauben zusammenhängt." On the whole, however, he has done his work well, and we wish him a greater measure of success than we dare to expect.

DEVOTIONAL.

In *Christ in the Christian Life* (Longmans: 7s. 6d. net) we have an English version, by the Rev. J. J. Burke, C.S.P., of the French work by Rev. J. Duperray, on St. Paul's doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. It is a simple exposition, assuming much that is to be found in larger works such as Prat, avoiding controversy, careful only to safeguard the doctrine from extreme conclusions which may run into pantheism and the rest. The order and analysis, together with the full quotations of the texts of St. Paul, make this book particularly useful

both for meditation and instruction. Old ground has been measured out anew, and the pathways have been well marked. A chapter at the end, showing how St. Paul fulfilled the teaching in his own life, is singularly happy.

The life of union with God, by means of the three theological virtues, being wholly supernatural, must be supernaturally supported. God has provided this nourishment for the supernatural life in prayer, the Sacraments and means of grace generally. M. l'Abbé L. Julien in *Pour mieux aimer le bon Dieu* (Beauchesne: 15.00 fr.), after describing in what supernatural life consists, takes each of these means and explains it in detail with much accuracy and wealth of illustration.

The addresses which the famous Bishop Dupanloup delivered to women in the sixties of last century have often been reprinted. The sixth edition of these *Conférences aux Femmes Chrétiennes* (Téqui: 10 fr.), first issued by the Abbé Lagrange in 1880, shows their continued popularity.

A more limited public is addressed in *Conferentiæ ad usum Sacerdotum* (Marii e Marietti: 15.00 l.), composed by Rev. V. A. Sprengers, edited by Rev. C. Sprengers, and containing much fresh and inspiring doctrine for monthly recollection days.

Very suitable for Lenten reading is *Dies Irae: interpreted for devotional reading and meditation* (Herder Book Co.: 6s. n.), by the Rev. N. Gihl, D.D., which the Rev. Joseph Schmit has translated into English. The thought in each stanza is explained and put in its dogmatic setting by the author, who also contributes an introduction discussing the source and history of the poem. The Latin text is given from the Missal followed by one—not very satisfactory—of the innumerable English versions.

M. le Chanoine Thévenot in *La Jeune Femme Chrétienne à l'école de Sainte Marguerite-Marie* (Téqui: 4.00 fr.) considers the salient virtues in the Saint's character, and describes how they can be, and need to be, practised by young women in the world.

HOMILETIC.

Generally courses of Sunday sermons are based upon the Sunday Gospels. The Rev. M. A. Chapman in *The Epistle of Christ* (Herder Book Co.: 7s. n.) has introduced a welcome novelty into his course by taking his texts from the Sunday Epistles. These sermons are welcome too on other grounds, for they are full of sound thought and apt illustration.

The pastoral solicitude of Bishop William von Keppler of Rottenburg is well illustrated by the instructions on sacred oratory which his translator, the Rev. H. Macdonald, calls *Homiletic Thoughts and Counsels* (Herder Book Co.: 5s. n.), and which develop a score of points that go to make a good preacher.

HISTORICAL.

The greater part of the Seventeenth Volume published by the United States Catholic Historical Society, and styled *Historical Records and Studies*, is occupied by a biography of John Gilmary Shea, the famous author of "The History of the Catholic Church in the United States." The sixteen pages devoted to enumerating the titles of his works are

evidence of the prodigious industry of this devout Catholic writer who was a pioneer in many directions of historical research, and who was content for the greater part of his life to labour in comparative obscurity. His great history, which ends with 1866, occupied the last six years of his life and was completed in 1892 when he was 68 years old. What one man could do, equipped with the zeal, energy and learning of a true lover of history, Dr. Shea did, to rescue from oblivion the chequered story of some 350 years of Church life. He deserves in many respects to be called the Lingard of America. The remainder of the volume contains an account of an eminent Catholic lawyer of North Carolina, Judge William Gaston, 1778—1844, whose noble two days' speech in favour of toleration, delivered at the North Carolina Convention in 1835, is reprinted as an appendix.

The zealous labours of the Westminster Federation to induce public authorities to free the historical text-books in use in the elementary schools from at least the grosser anti-Catholic errors will have emphasized what has long been familiar to Catholic teachers—the need of a thoroughly reliable students' History of England. Several attempts have been made to supply this need: we know of none better than the latest, **A Short History of England** (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d. n.), by the Rev. P. J. Moran, S.J., which—presumably a first part—stops at the Conquest. Father Moran proceeds on the sound principle of going to the original sources, and dealing with his matter chronologically, leaving the student, with the master's aid, to group and classify cognate facts and events. He emphasizes the importance of geography in history study, and provides excellent sketch maps for the scholar to work on. We feel convinced that for examination purposes this book could hardly be improved.

SOCIOLOGICAL.

Obviously the best way of combating Socialism is to remove the main evils of which it purports to be the remedy. It will not flourish on grievances which are purely imaginary, and it should have no real grievances if industry were only Christianized. That is the *raison d'être* of the "Confédération Internationale des Syndicats Chrétiens," established at the Hague Congress in 1920, and reaching a fuller development in the subsequent years. **L'Internationale Syndicale Chrétienne dans les Années 1922 à 1925** (published by the Confédération at Utrecht) gives a history of progress during these years, and a *compte rendu* of the third Congress at Lucerne in 1925. It is a volume full of interest, displaying a vast amount of activity over a wide range, in the endeavour to acquire and present the Christian view of industrial problems in each country, and thus guide, Catholic thought at any rate, through various economic mazes. The Confédération has a Secretarial and an Executive Bureau, and a membership of a round dozen of national syndicates in Europe; there is unhappily no British representative in this: "White International."

An immense deal of reading, study and research has gone to the production of **The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain** (The Macmillan Co.: 10s. 6d.), by Georgiana Putnam McEntee, Ph.D., of New York, and many British Catholics will learn from these pregnant pages for the first time how real is the social mission of the Church and how

gallantly it has been undertaken, in the face of innumerable difficulties, by the more zealous and far-seeing of our fellow-Catholics. Miss McEntee's story begins practically with Manning: before 1850 when the Church in England regained its canonical hierarchy Catholic effort could not well be organized: and incidentally she recalls much Catholic history which is not merely social. Each chapter is followed by its documentation which shows how thoroughly Miss McEntee has mastered the very voluminous literature of her subject: it is gratifying to record that she seems well acquainted with the files of *THE MONTH*. No single personality arose after Manning's death to rally Catholic forces for social reform, but in these later days an organization created for that specific purpose—the Catholic Social Guild—has arisen to carry on his work. Naturally, a large portion of the book is devoted to the fortunes of this organization, and Miss McEntee does full justice to the great influence of Father Charles Dominic Plater (now seven years dead) in moulding and directing it. We think that Miss McEntee might have added a chapter on the immense, unrecorded social work accomplished by our Catholic Sisterhoods, which is yearly growing in extent and importance. The gradual abandonment of insularity is carefully traced in a well-informed chapter called "Foreign Contacts." Altogether the book should be for English Catholics a source of strength and inspiration.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

Distinguished by an appreciative preface from the pen of Mgr. Baudrillart, the *Life of Mère Saint-Michel* (Beauchesne: 24.00 fr.), a religious of the Congregation of St. Thomas of Villanova, by Mme Alix Aylicson, unfolds in intimate detail the career of a holy soul devoted to the cause of Christian education. English readers will find a point of contact with her in the fact that she made a foundation of her Congregation at Carlisle, which, after seventeen fruitful years, had to be closed.

A modern English Life of the saintly coadjutor of St. Teresa in the Carmelite reform has long been desired, and his proclamation last year as a doctor of the Church gives welcome occasion for that produced by the Sisters of Notre Dame—*Life of St. John of the Cross: Mystical Doctor*—introduced by Father Benedict Zimmerman, O.D.C., and published in the usual tasteful format by Mr. T. Baker. Not only is the story of the reform told with conscientious detail, but a careful analysis is made of St. John's mystical works which students will find most useful. The Life itself is full of edification, illustrating in many phases the root-doctrine of Christianity, glory through suffering and triumph through defeat.

In *The Fate of the Fenwicks: From the Correspondence of Mary Hays, 1797—1827* (Methuen: 12s. 6d.) Miss A. T. Wedd has composed a sort of sequel to her previous work, *The Love Letters of Mary Hays, (1779—1780)*. It is intensely interesting. Apart from the connection of the Fenwicks with Charles and Mary Lamb, we have here a picture from the life of a family tossed about in many lands exactly a hundred years ago; a picture of a family which, though of the usually speechless middle class, is able to describe itself and its vicissitudes with all the skill of a finished artist. It has experiences in many climes,—England, Ireland, the West Indies, North America—and the human element

throughout is necessarily much alive, for it is the story of a family fighting with misfortune all the time; it is a story which helps us to appreciate and love even those who may have gone under through their own fault. Mrs. Fenwick in particular we value; a woman from her very nature doomed to fail; yet cheerful and human and brave, and passing off the stage with yet a further venture in project. We thank the editor for these very living letters; to publish them has been abundantly worth while.

The coming centenary of Catholic Emancipation makes welcome every new light that is thrown on the condition of Catholics in this country a hundred years ago. In the **Life of Mother Mary Agnes Amherst** (Catholic Records Press, Exeter: 10s. 6d.) we are given another insight, first of all into the home life of one of our most noted Catholic families of that time, then into the noble work, done by the Rosminian Fathers, for the faith in England, lastly into that accomplished by the Rosminian Sisters. If the Life in itself is a record, for the most part, of the heroism that is found in routine and monotonous endurance, it is nevertheless profusely interspersed with the names of those who sowed the seed in our Second Spring. It is a Life that has deserved to be written, for its own sake and because of its circumstances.

Books on Ste. Thérèse of Lisieux continue to appear. All tell us of her "Little way"; one is sometimes tempted to ask whether, since it needs so much explanation, it can be so "little" or so "simple" after all. But this is only a temptation; the truth is that her very simplicity provokes writers of many kinds to write enthusiastically about her. Father Benedict Williamson's **The Sure Way** (Kegan Paul: 10s. 6d.) is one more volume added to the list. It is not a life; it is rather a series of essays, twenty-one in number, on the saint's teaching looked at from various angles. The author has before him in particular the apostolic nature of Ste. Thérèse; in consequence he dwells on her significance in various states of life, religious, the priesthood, the family. He ends on a note which one might have expected; it is an appeal to non-Catholics to find in and through the "Little Flower" the solution of their problems.

FICTION.

Those shrewd and entertaining comments on the reactions of Catholic faith and practice with the daily affairs of life—life as led in U.S.A.—which Father C. D. McEnniry, C.S.S.R., calls **Father Tim's Talks with People he Met** (Herder Book Co.: 5s.), have spread into a sixth volume, which contains the best of moral physic mixed with moral jam in the most appetizing and healthful fashion. Add number six to the other five in your library, parent and school teacher.

"Artless" is the word which best describes, in detail and as a whole, the long "novel with a purpose" written by the late Miss S. A. Turk, and published by her sister as a memorial to her, which is styled **The Marriage of Enid Ruthven** or the **Evil of a Godless Education** (Salesian Press: Battersea). Yet its simplicity has its own charm, and the book is full of varied incident as well as of a high and fearless morality. Miss Turk had evidently travelled widely, and observed closely: and a fluent style enables her to convey a vast amount of information about the scenes she had visited and the faith that was hers.

An attractively bound volume, **Blue Gowns** (Catholic F.M. Society, Maryknoll: \$1.50), by Alice Dease, has still more attractive contents in the shape of a number of interesting and edifying stories of the Chinese Missions, showing what excellent Catholics the Chinese make and what progress the Faith is making in that ancient civilization. A number of extraordinarily good illustrations add to the charm of the volume.

There is a light fancy and a playful humour about **More Eton Fables** (Longmans: 3s.6d. n.), by the Rev. Cyril Alington, which tends to recommend the sound and edifying morals, cleverly conveyed by them.

Everyone in Miss Margaret Muir's **My Donald** (Stockwell: 2s.6d. n.) is either being converted, having been converted, or about to be converted. The Protestants are all very bitter, the Catholics very fervent. There are many fine ideas in the book, but the pious motif is somewhat too prominent.

The example and inspiration of the English martyrs have been deftly woven as motif into one of Miss Enid Dinnis's most charming tales, **The Road to Somewhere** (Sands: 3s.6d. n.). Her lively fancy, moving naturally and without strain, arranges a comparatively simple train of incidents to illustrate how the contagion of heroism exhibited under Elizabethan tyranny can be caught by a very modern individual, and put him successfully through a hard test, involving the possible loss of love and fortune. But devotion to honour is rewarded by faith, and the book ends with what the true romancist always wants,—the happiness of those who have awakened his interest and affection.

VERSE.

The poet who wrote **Parvulus and Other Poems** (Ernest Benn: 1s.6d. n.) is, I am sure, a poetess: one who would appreciate Plotinus, and does appreciate wild flowers ("A Wild Flower" is one of the freshest of these poems, fresh though they all of them be, and fragrant), and has (rare miracle!) accepted Oxford and survived it. For I am sure that the poem "Oxford" implies that she was "up" there. For once culture has not ousted humour; nor are simple things elaborately hymned; nor are philosophy and joyous Christianity at variance. Much of this little book is quite lovely: the one thing we beg is, that the author should try her hand at hymns. She has succeeded in so many things—who knows, she might do so in that hardest of all poetic forms.

Miss Margaret Mackenzie's new collection of verse—**The Seeker and other Poems** (Sheed and Ward: 2s.6d.)—include, in varied metres, many beautiful fancies, all shot through with a vivid faith. Love of Nature in the marshlands, love of Italy, love of Heaven, chase each other from lyric to sonnet, from quatrain to loose-strung narrative. In "Assisi," a four-stanzaed iambic poem, the reader will find what is most characteristic of Miss Mackenzie's muse—imagination, spiritual insight, and a gift of happy music.

YEAR BOOKS.

Apart from the most useful information regarding the functioning of Catholicism in Great Britain—that indispensable list of Churches, Hours of Service, Clergy and Religious—popular interest in the **Catholic Directory for 1928** (B.O. and W.: 3s.6d.) is attracted by the statistics

giving the growth of the Church in this country and in the world at large. Concerning England a reasonable dissatisfaction is expressed regarding the imperfection of the record of Catholics in each diocese. The public census is no help but it is thought that the 'parochial census'—returns of the zealous clergy—would secure a fair approach to completeness. As the centenary of Emancipation approaches, the question grows in interest.

A biographical dictionary of prominent British Catholics in 1828 might have been issued for a few pence. Our modern **Catholic Who's Who for 1928** (B.O. and W.: 5s. n.) is considerably more expensive, but who shall say it is not worth the cost? A growth of six pages over last year's does not fully indicate the accession of numbers for, of course, it is a net result. The Editor has always to subtract as well as to add. Mr. Algernon Cecil's thoughtful and encouraging preface should on no account be missed.

A younger brother of the *Catholic Directory* which is now in its eighth year of issue might in 1828 have occupied a four page leaflet. We refer to the **Jesuit Directory for 1928** (B.O. & W.: 6d. n.) giving in its 112 pages a full record of the activities of the English Province permanent and occasional. Father Edward King, its present Editor, has had the melancholy duty of including an obituary notice of its first Editor and founder, Father David Thompson.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A very compendious handbook, called **Good Scouting** (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d. n.), has been compiled by an enthusiast on the subject, Miss Vera Barclay, and a mere glance through it is enough to show how full of possibilities for sound character training the movement is. How to turn those possibilities into actualities is the object of the book, and the authoress spares no pains to make her teaching thoroughly practical. The time has passed when it was considered dangerous for Catholics to take up the scout-idea. The movement is not undenominational but interdenominational, and Catholics have a distinct and recognized place in it. Miss Barclay's book should do much to encourage it.

That ever-progressive branch of the greatest Mission-aid Society of the Church, the New York S.P.F., has done well to produce, or perhaps re-produce, in **Catholic Missions in Figures and Symbols**, compiled by Dr. R. Streit, O.M.I. (New York: \$1.25), the salient facts concerning the pagan world and the present status of Christianity. In many respects the volume is most encouraging, but it shows how far we have yet to tread before the desires of the Redeemer of Mankind reach their fulfilment. The letter-press is most informative and the diagrams speak with resistless force. We do not imagine for a moment that the publishers have intended to do more than give the wider circulation of the English-speaking peoples to a volume, the substance of which, and much of the form besides, was produced in Rome at the time of the Vatican Exhibition. Diagrams at first seem confusing; but study them a bit with the aid of the excellent letter-press, and they tell eloquently of the missionary needs of the day.

It certainly speaks wonders for the courage of the missionary ladies,

Miss Mildred Cable and Miss Francesca French, that they should have successfully performed the journey across Central Asia described in their book—**Through Jade Gate and Central Asia: An account of Journeys in Kansu, Turkestan and the Gobi Desert** (Constable: 10s. n.). Though the object of their trek is not clear, for one can scarcely call it a journey of exploration, much less a missionary tour, still it teems with information which brings home to the reader what a very different thing to his own is the life of teeming millions, who indeed make up more than half of the population of the world. The authors' style is crowded, too crowded for the ordinary reader, who would gladly know more of many things of which he is given but a glimpse; nevertheless, they provide us with a book full of interest, and, at the same time, provocative of admiration for those who dared so much for the cause they loved. Unconsciously in one place they betray that they are no longer young women, that they have grown grey in the service of the missions; on this account we do them the more honour and commend this record of travel to our readers.

Through the somewhat formal vehicle of a correspondence between an Abbé and a student, called **Pour Vivre en Beauté** (Téqui: 6.00 fr.), Canon Henri Morice, Doc.Lit., explains how only the Christian religion faithfully practised results in moral beauty and enables us to appreciate properly physical beauty as well. He has written in effect a most persuasive treatise on the text "Seek first the Kingdom of God . . . and the rest will be given you without seeking."

Mr. B. D. Jones in his **A Varsity Career** (Heffer: 3s. 6d. n.) has some sensible pages on the need of foreseeing and planning for a profession in life. Boys seldom can do this: therefore parents should do it more than they do. The rest of the book, dealing with life at the University, is perhaps not of so much use. Preliminary advice should be, we hold, either quite mechanical (*i.e.*, concerned with money, the technique of examinations, the right "formula") or profound and concerned with principle; both kinds of advice are precluded by the limits of the book and the position of its author. Anyhow the happy-go-lucky and unconscious days of University life are over. Men are too poor; education-alists are too fussy; Oxford and Cambridge have a score of growing provincial rivals and are themselves increasingly "provincial." May our Universities, at least, become no mere machines for manufacturing degrees.

A short allegory, after the conception of Bunyan and in the style of Mallory, called **Two Knights and how they fared in a Great Adventure** (Sheed and Ward: 5s.) has been written by Father Edward Rockcliff, S.J., and illustrated by Mr. H. S. P. Taylor. The story is the life-history of the weak Christian and the strong,—the one loving the world and refusing supernatural help, the other making friends with virtue and so overcoming evil. The allegory is well worked out, although the conventional language makes it rather stiff: on the other hand, the frequent illustrations in a bold original style are very effective, and harmonize with the highly ornamental type. An excellent present for the growing boy or girl.

A fine indication of the catholicity of science is afforded by the publication, in a handsome volume adorned by Father Hagen's portrait, of the homage rendered to that venerable and distinguished astro-

nomer, the Director of the Vatican Observatory, by scientific persons and institutions all over the world on the occasion of his 80th birthday last year. An impression of the Papal medal commemorating the occasion and presented by his Holiness in person adorns the cover.

It is a pleasure to receive a second series of the **Lectures in Hyde Park** (S.P.C.K.: 2s. 6d.), delivered by the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. These five discourses are entitled *If we believe in God*, and in them we detect the refinement of the scholar combined with a knowledge of the ordinary human nature that frequents the "Hyde Park Cathedral." The two lectures on Free-Will and the Problem of Pain seem to us particularly good, nor is there anything in the rest which is out of harmony with Catholic orthodoxy. They are lively and anecdotal and carefully documented.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The Liturgy of the Forty Hours' Prayer (C.T.S. of Ireland: 2d.), compiled by the Rev. J. B. O'Connell, contains in compact form all that is necessary for the understanding and correct conduct of this great Catholic devotion, according to the latest instructions of the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

Through Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne, the same author has issued a very full commentary on the **Clementine Instruction concerning the Right Ordering of the Forty Hours' Prayer** (1s. 6d.) with a short history of the devotion.

The booklet entitled **Correct Serving at the Altar** (Messenger Print, Carthagen, Ohio: 25 cents: reduction for quantities) is the fullest we have seen amongst the many helps for Mass-boys now issued. It is based by its author, Father Gilbert Esser, C.P.P.S., on the last edition of Wapelhorst.

The growth of liturgical prayer should be hastened by the publication of **A Guide to the Use of the Roman Breviary** (B.O. and W.: 1s. 6d.) in the format of the liturgical books issued by the firm. The print is rather small: perhaps, the pamphlet is meant to serve as an introduction to a future Breviary.

The C.T.S. has actually, for the first time in its history, sold over a million pamphlets in a year, the year 1927. And it does not mean to stop there. Two new pamphlets are to hand,—**The Saints of the Mass**, short biographies, by Mother Philippa of York, and **Between Ourselves Once More**, another of Mr. J. O'Connor's helpful "talks" to boys.

From the C.T.S. of Ireland comes the first part of a reasoned explanation of **The Catholic Doctrine of the Real Presence**, by the Rev. W. Moran of Maynooth—an especially useful pamphlet in the present Anglican "crisis." Also **The Sanity of Catholicism**, by Father Albert Power, S.J., showing how supremely reasonable rightly understood the Catholic Faith is.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- ALBERT DEWIT, Brussels.**
A propos de l'Evangile. By G. Hoornaert, S.J. Pp. 488.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.**
La Confession Orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila, Latin Text edited by A. Malvy, S.J., and M. Viller, S.J. Pp. cxxxi. 223. Price, 35.00 fr.
- BREPOL'S CATHOLIC PRESS, Turnhout.**
Hours with Christ, from the Flemish. Edited by A. Coppens, S.J. Pp. 144. Price, 2s.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.**
The Clementine Instruction regarding the Forty Hours Prayer. Translated with a commentary by Rev. J. B. O'Connell. Pp. x. 54. Price, 1s. 6d. *Some Spiritual Guides.* By Abbé Huvelin. Translated with an Introduction by the Rev. Joseph Leonard, C.M. Pp. lxxvi. 195. Price, 6s. *The Catholic Directory for 1928.* Price, 3s. 6d. *The Catholic Who's Who for 1928.* Price, 5s. n. *Prayer and Poetry.* By Henri Bremond. Translated by Algar Thorold. Pp. vii. 200. Price, 7s. 6d. *Christian Spirituality.* By Père Pourrat. Vol. III. Translated by W. H. Mitchell. Pp. xii. 405. Price, 10s. 6d. *The Broad View.* By J. Serre. Translated by C. E. Benham. Pp. 130. Price, 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. *Victim Souls.* By Abbé Giloteaux. Translated by L. M. G. Bond. Pp. xix. 277. Price, 7s. 6d. *The Jesuit Directory for 1928.* Edited by E. King, S.J. Pp. 112. Price, 6d. *Guide to the Use of the Roman Breviary.* By L. C. Sheppard. Pp. vii. 53. Price, 1s. 6d.
- C.T.S., London.**
Several twopenny pamphlets.
- C.T.S. of Ireland.**
Several twopenny pamphlets.
- GILL & SON, Dublin.**
The Story of St. Columba. By "Iona." Illustrated. Pp. 72. Price, 2s. 6d. n.
- HERDER, Freiburg.**
Vorbeugende Caritas für die Kinder. Pp. xii. 90. Price, 1.80 m.
- HUTCHINSON & Co., London.**
The Man Disraeli. By Wilfrid Meynell. Illustrated. Pp. xiii. 228. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- JOHN MURPHY, Co. Baltimore.**
What is Heresy? By G. M. Vizeninovich. Pp. x. 130. Price, \$1.50.
- KEGAN PAUL, London.**
Religious Conversion. By Prof. Sante de Santis. Translated by Helen Augur. Pp. 324. Price, 12s. 6d. n.
- LONGMANS, London.**
Seventeenth Century Lyrics. Edited by Norman Ault. Pp. xi. 524. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *Christ in the Common Ways of Life.* By Canon Woodward. Pp. vi. 99. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Luther and the Reformation.* By J. MacKinnon. Vol. II. Pp. xvii. 354. Price, 16s. n.
- LOUVAIN UNIVERSITY.**
John Gerson: Reformer and Mystic. By James J. Connolly, M.A. Illustrated. Pp. xx. 408.
- MESENGER, Carthage (Ohio).**
Correct Serving at the Altar. By G. F. Esser, C.P.P.S. Pp. 104. Price, 25c.
- PONT. ACCAD. DELLE SCIENZE, Rome.**
P. G. Hagen, S.J., 1847-1927.
- SANDS & Co., London.**
The Road to Somewhere. By Enid Dinnis. Pp. 151. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *Blessed L.M.G. de Montfort.* By A. Somers, S.M.M. Pp. 46. Price, 1s. *The Divine Refreshment.* By Robert Eaton. Pp. x. 170. Price, 2s. 6d. n.
- SELWYN & BLOUNT, London.**
From the Log of a Physician. By X.Y.Z. Pp. 94. Price, 2s. 6d.
- SHEED & WARD, London.**
Father Reginald Buckler, O.P. By C. M. Antony. Pp. viii. 155. Price, 4s. 6d. n. *Two Knights.* By Edward Rockliff, S.J. Illustrated. Pp. 44. Price, 5s.
- S.P.C.K., London.**
The Date of Easter. By D. R. Fotheringham. Pp. xv. 56. Price, 2s. 6d. n.
- TIPOGRAFIA CAT. CASALS, Barcelona.**
Lecciones de Apologetica. By Fr. N. M. Negueruela. 2 Vols. 2nd edit. Pp. xvi. 280, 440. Price, 12.50 pesetas.

